

THE

# DUBLIN REVIEW.

---

APRIL, 1891.

---

## ART. I.—HYPNOTISM.

IT may appear superfluous to add one more to the numerous articles on hypnotism which have been contributed to the reviews and magazines during the last year or two. Most of these, however, have aimed—not unnaturally—at describing the marvellous phenomena of hypnotism, rather than at examining the results with care, or suggesting any explanation of them. There are great differences of opinion among hypnotists as to nearly all the facts observed, and the inferences to be drawn from them; so that it seems to me that I shall be doing a service if I attempt to compare the various statements made, more carefully than has been done in the popular articles on the subject. Such an examination is a necessary preliminary to considering the moral and social bearings of hypnotism; very grave questions on which I have no intention of intruding, but for which I trust the material I have brought together may be of service. It is needful that I should trace shortly the history of the subject, in order to show the parentage of the two schools, to the one or the other of which hypnotists belong. Hypnotism has had a strange history everywhere, but most of all in this country. Having been long the toy of conjurers and quacks, “animal magnetism”—as it was then called—had the chance of serious study fifty years ago by one of the leading physicians of London. His unavoidable mistakes, and still more his eager credulity, gave a handle to the professional bigotry or jealousy of his critics which they were not slow to seize, and Elliotson was condemned to untimely ruin and oblivion. But the investigation which he began was continued in a more sober spirit by a surgeon of Manchester, Mr. Braid, who confined himself to the study of such phenomena as he could verify by physical observation and experi-

ment, using the term hypnotism to mark the new direction he had given to the subject, and not to prejudge the nature of the agent he was investigating. It has been allowed by all who have followed him that the right method of studying the subject dates from Braid. But, whether from the example of Elliotson's fate, or some other reason, Braid's researches never attracted in this country the interest that might have been expected, and, indeed, remained practically unknown, save for the mention of them by Dr. Carpenter. Hypnotism did not become a recognised branch of scientific study until it was taken up by one of the greatest of living physicians, Professor Charcot, of Paris, in 1878. His confessed eminence, complete knowledge of allied conditions, and marvellous descriptive powers, enabled him to carry the day, but not without a severe struggle; and I have seldom been more interested than when hearing him describe his anxiety, while he still doubted whether hypnotism might not prove fatal even to his professional reputation. The result of his labours has been the establishment of the largest school for the study of hypnotism at the Salpêtrière Hospital in Paris, and to him we owe the interest which has been awakened in Germany, Italy, and even in England. But he had been preceded in the study of hypnotism in France by a medical man at Nancy, Dr. Liébeault, who as long ago as 1866 published a short work on the subject. His observations, however, remained unnoticed, until eighteen years later they were brought forward by Bernheim, a professor in the same town, since which time his teaching has been well known to the scientific world. Charcot and Liébeault, studying these phenomena independently, have been led to different conclusions, and have thus founded the rival schools of Paris and Nancy, to which it will be so often necessary to refer. In spite of all the ardour and industry which has been displayed, much will be seen to be uncertain, much remains unexplored, and still more is imperfectly understood. But, in what is proved beyond the possibility of doubt, and admitted on all hands as certain, there is so much which has the most important bearing on human responsibility, as to interest, and even alarm, those who seriously consider it. The psychological results of hypnotism, though inferior in practical interest to its moral and social consequences, suggest many problems of importance which open out new fields for study.

It will be seen as I proceed that the difference between the two schools of hypnotisers is, to a great degree, due to an ambiguous use of the word hypnotism. It would, therefore, be most logical to begin with the various definitions of the word; but this we are not in a position to do until some account has been given of the process and the means by which it is carried



out. First, as to the means employed. Charcot's school teaches that the ordinary and most certain way of hypnotising subjects is by using physical agencies of various kinds, but all agreeing in this, that they stimulate monotonously the nervous system. Such are the "magnetic passes" of the old mesmerists, causing the subject to look steadily at some bright object, slight electrical currents, or gentle friction, or the impression may be made on the hearing by means of a monster tuning-fork, a gong, &c. Richet relates the case of a woman who fell into the hypnotic state at each stroke of the kettle-drum at a concert, and apparently many of the instances of catalepsy during a thunderstorm are to be accounted for in the same way. On the other hand, the school of Nancy hold that hypnotism is produced by suggestion, and that these means which I have just enumerated act simply by putting the subject into a condition of expectancy and confident belief. The first part of this statement is undoubtedly true. Long before the recent development of hypnotism, the Abbé Faria was wont in Paris to mesmerise persons by merely placing them in a chair and saying imperiously *Dormez*; and Braid also remarked that mere belief in the power of the operator was enough for the purpose. There is abundant evidence to the same effect since, the most striking instance being that of persons hypnotised at a distance from the operator, and at a moment chosen by him, which has been done not merely to excitable French girls, but to German medical students, and to others whose cases have been recorded in general periodicals. But Dr. Liébeault's followers seem to go too far when they deny that the manœuvres described are not the most certain and dependable means of producing hypnotism. It will be sufficient to appeal to Father Kircher's old experiment, in which a cock is hypnotised by holding his beak against a chalk line, to prove that these means act where there can be no expectancy on the part of the subject. Still less can it be said that "the whole thing is mere fancy," as English so-called common-sense is apt too roughly to assume. The contrary is shown conclusively by experiments, not only on animals, but on persons in sound, natural sleep, whom Berger and Gscheidlén have repeatedly hypnotised, no appeal to the imagination being then possible.

The proportion of persons susceptible of hypnotism is so very differently estimated by various authorities—ranging from 10 to 95 per cent.—that it would evidently be unprofitable to go into the question so stated. It is more important to consider whether the susceptibility can be connected with any known peculiarities of the subjects. It is, in the first place, certain that mere general excitability is not a necessary, or even a favourable, condition. Some of the most remarkable results have been obtained by

Heidenhain and Hensen in phlegmatic German medical students. Nor have we any immunity in this country: the rash and unjustifiable experiments of "electro-biologists" are sufficient to prove this; and some of the most interesting observations on the results of hypnotism were made by Mr. E. Gurney on a healthy young baker in Brighton. Indeed, paradoxical as it may seem, quiet, unemotional people are generally more easily hypnotised than excitable ones. The chief requisite is the power of fixing the attention; and for this reason very young children, idiots, and most insane persons cannot be influenced. The susceptibility is greatly increased by practice. Richet, for example, tells us of a girl with whom he entirely failed the first time, the second time he hypnotised her in ten minutes, the third time in five; after that a look or a word of command acted instantaneously. The fact is abundantly proved, and of great practical importance. The Paris school teach that hypnotism can only be successfully produced in persons of the hysterical temperament; and, indeed, they go so far as to say that true hypnotism (*la grande hypnose*) is merely a manifestation of hysteria. They qualify this statement, however, by two additions, which it is important to note. The term hysterical temperament is used to denote, not the condition popularly so called, but certain symptoms recognisable only by a physician, and compatible with apparent good health. They also admit that incomplete hypnotic states may sometimes be produced in non-hysterical subjects. Very different is the teaching of the school of Nancy; in their view healthy persons are the more readily influenced, and hysteria is rather an obstacle to hypnotism. This contradiction is connected with an equally opposed way of looking at the phenomena of hypnotism. Charcot's school consider it to be a diseased condition, closely allied to hysteria, if not merely one of the manifestations of that protean disease, and characterised by three forms or stages, through which every complete access, so to speak, must pass. Each of these stages presents well-marked bodily symptoms, which have been studied with great care, it being thought that in these a security had been found against simulation. In the condition they term *Lethargy*, the subject lies as if asleep and apparently unconscious, though he is sometimes able to say afterwards what has been done to him. Pressure on the nerves and muscles produces contractions which, from their character and extent, are supposed to be the surest guarantee against fraud. When the patient is made to pass into *Catalepsy*, the muscular condition is quite different. He can be placed in any attitude, and will retain it, no matter how unnatural or contorted, for a period far beyond what would be possible to voluntary effort. The mental state is very remarkable. The subject is incapable of any spontaneous action, and is reduced

to the state of a living marionette or automaton, reacting simply to external impressions. For instance, if the limbs be placed in an attitude corresponding to any state of mind, such as pugilism, veneration, prayer, or the like, the features at once assume the expression appropriate to that state, the most perfect *tableaux vivants*, resembling Michael Angelo's or Da Vinci's drawings, being produced. But the attitudes thus caused gradually fade away, leaving only the impassive mask of catalepsy; and there is no speculation in those features which had just been animated by the perfect semblance of horror, love, anger, or devotion. Or the cataleptic may be made to perform such simple acts as tapping with the foot, twirling the thumbs, &c., and will then continue them for some time with monotonous regularity. There is usually no recollection of what has occurred during catalepsy. In the third stage, *Somnambulism*, the muscles are in a state of increased irritability, which it would seem impossible to simulate. The skin is usually insensible, but the other senses are active, hearing in particular being very acute; and many instances of supposed clairvoyance are evidently due to this acuteness. The state of the mind is even more strange than in catalepsy. As long as the subject is not acted upon from without, the mind appears to be a perfect blank, but he can be readily communicated with, and receives unhesitatingly every suggestion made to him by his hypnotiser, whose puppet he becomes. This is the condition in which he is deceived as to the properties of substances given him to taste or to handle, which are the stock experiments of popular "electro-biologists." Hallucinations of any kind may be suggested, and are perceived with all the senses, or, if it be preferred, with one eye or ear only. Or, some person, object, or part of an object, may be blotted out from the subject's perception, or he may be allowed to see only one object, for instance, one horse only in a crowded street. More strictly mental effects may be suggested. The memory of individual persons or things may be obliterated, or the belief of the subject in his own personality may be changed, and he be made to believe he is a rabbit, an actress, a soldier, &c., acting according to such belief with unquestioning faith. Or the personality remaining, the opinions may be altered, an ardent Bonapartist being converted into a Republican. I will not dwell now on the question, whether there are any limits to this power of suggestion, as I shall have to return to that later.

This is an exceedingly brief account of the phenomena of hypnotism, according to the school founded by Charcot. Nothing could be more definite than the three stages I have described, and no other disease has been studied with more enthusiasm, energy, and attention. After saying so much, it will appear confounding

to add that the account given by the Nancy hypnotisers is entirely different. According to M. Liébeault and his followers, the hypnotic state is not a diseased condition at all. They believe the fundamental condition is one closely akin to ordinary sleep, produced by the suggestion of the operator and the conviction of the subject. The chief difference from ordinary sleep is, that the subject remains in close relation to the hypnotiser, so that his thoughts and acts are controlled by the latter. This school has also arranged the symptoms of hypnotism in several stages; but they may all be reduced to three—somnia, light sleep and profound sleep, which last corresponds to the Paris somnambulism (Forel). They hold that, as a rule, the last stage, with all its consequences, is only reached after repeated trials, the "suggestibility" of the subject rapidly increasing with habit.

Neither of these parties seems at present disposed to yield to the other; but there can be no doubt that the opinion of foreigners generally, and lately even of some distinguished Parisian physicians, inclines very decidedly to the Nancy explanation. This has, above all, the great advantage that it accounts for the phenomena observed by its opponents, as well as for those collected on its own behalf. It will be remembered that the Salpêtrière school experiments exclusively upon hysterical persons, who are alone, it teaches, amenable to the hypnotic influence. But every physician is only too well aware of the marvellous power that hysterical women have to counterfeit disease, and of the almost incredible skill, patience, and fortitude which they will employ to simulate any malady that they find renders them objects of interest and attention. When to this is added the force of suggestion inherent in the process of hypnotism, it does not seem at all unlikely that the Paris operators themselves produce, by unconscious suggestion, the phenomena they study. Probably phenomena corresponding to the three stages of Charcot occurred in the first case or two observed by that illustrious physician, and sufficient care was not thereupon taken to exclude the possibility of unintentional suggestion, of which the importance was then unknown. The slightest hint of manner or word would be sufficient to let the hysterical subjects know what was expected of them, and repeated experiment would but confirm the result of the earliest observations. Most operators outside the Salpêtrière school have had the same experience as one of the latest writers on the subject, the distinguished Parisian, M. Déjerine. He says:

I have never yet been able to observe the Salpêtrière phenomena in subjects who had never been previously hypnotised, although I have sought for them on each occasion with great care, while avoiding the possibility of suggestion. . . . On the other hand, in

several of these cases I have obtained, by suggestion, all the stages described above, and produced the complete type of "la grande hypnose," sometimes from the beginning, and after a very few trials. . . . In a word, the subjects reproduced at will, either the type of the school of the Salpêtrière, or the type of the school of Nancy. In other terms, I have never obtained anything which was spontaneous, or personal, so to speak, to the subject under experiment, nothing which in my judgment was not due to suggestion.\*

Whichever of these two ways of looking at the facts that hypnotism has revealed be accepted, these clearly call for some explanation which shall connect them with the other phenomena of mental life. There are difficulties in the way of every hypothesis that can be suggested; the one that has received the most general assent is due to Professor Heidenhain. He pointed out that all the physical means employed for hypnotising are slight monotonous stimuli of the sensory nerves, and he supposed—what seems very probable—that the highest nervous centres in the brain are thereby exhausted, and so rendered incapable of their ordinary functions. Now these centres, as I have formerly had occasion to point out in this Review,† are inhibitory or controlling. They limit or check all irregular action of the lower centres, and are thus the necessary condition of the faculty of attention, and thereby of all higher thought. By the temporary disablement of these highest centres the subject, then, would become unable to direct the course of his thoughts, and would unresistingly receive all suggestions that reached him from without. He would lose (as we all do in dreams) that power of comparison with the other data of his mind, which alone enables any of us to judge of the truth or falsity of any statement or perception that may be presented to our consciousness. Hypnotism, on this theory, differs from natural sleep chiefly by the power of suggestion which the operator acquires over his subject; and we are thus landed once more in the view taken by the Nancy school.

I will not here dwell upon the theoretical and purely psychological results of hypnotism. It has been aptly called "a vivisection of the mind," and the industry and skill with which it has been used for the purpose of psychological research have led to some very interesting and unforeseen results. I will only remark on one of them, which indeed includes them all. Hypnotism strongly confirms the view of modern science, that much of our mental life is unconscious and ordinarily unknown to us. Since Descartes' revolt from scholasticism, it has been held by

\* *Médecine Moderne*, January 25, 1891.

† "The Physiological Psychology of St. Thomas," April 1882, p. 355.

psychologists that our mental life reached no further than our consciousness directly showed us; and that the world of thought within—as the ancients thought of the world without—was measured by our unaided faculties. The opposite doctrine is expressed—inappropriately enough—by the phrase “unconscious cerebration.” On this view, the mind of each of us is an unknown territory, lying in darkness unexplored, save where our voluntarily directed consciousness casts a narrow ray of light, or where some more urgent perception or memory rises out of the gloom. Catholic philosophers will welcome the reversal of one of Descartes’ errors, against which their predecessors had protested in vain. And the practical bearing of such a conception, if grave and serious, is at least wholesome and bracing. Our sense of responsibility is greatly quickened when we realise that we have to shape our course in life across a much wider field than we had previously suspected, and that, without quitting the confines of our own minds, we can range from the highest to the lowest places. The peculiar horror of hypnotism is that we have been taught that this power of self-direction may abdicate, and that our organisms—nay, our very minds themselves—may become nothing but elaborate puppets in a stranger’s hands. Most of us will agree that such a possibility, if it be true, is more horrible than any legend of Oriental superstition or mediæval witchcraft; and we shall anxiously inquire how far our fears are grounded in fact. The answer is not quite reassuring. The power of suggestion does not merely apply to hallucinations, opinions, and beliefs; acts of any kind can be suggested to the subject, and may be performed by him with unresisting obedience. Many of the experiments of this kind that have been tried have been recorded in the articles that have appeared on hypnotism in the periodicals. The reader is therefore probably familiar with instances where subjects have been ordered to shoot or poison their dearest relatives, and have obeyed implicitly as far as lay in their power. The acts suggested are performed with all the accuracy of a machine, and yet often with more skill and fearlessness than the subject normally possesses. For instance, Féré tells us that he has given the order that a certain point on a card should be pierced with a penknife, and the act has been performed with a precision which would only be possible normally after minute measurement. It is impossible to refrain from Féré’s reflection that a criminal act would have been executed with the same accuracy. There is no limit to the character of the suggestions which may be acted upon; they may be absurd, immoral, criminal, and dangerous or injurious to the subject himself. They may be remembered after the hypnotic stage has ceased; but it only needs the command of the operator



to ensure absolute oblivion, or the belief that the suggestion comes from an innocent person. If this were all it would be serious enough; but what is more marvellous and more terrible remains to be told. Any of these suggestions may be made, which are to take effect after the subject has passed out of the hypnotic sleep, and is apparently in his or her usual condition. Nor is this power limited to the time immediately following hypnotism; the suggestions may be timed to come off and have been performed with unfailing punctuality at a distant period (*suggestions à longue échéance*). There are numerous instances in which the interval between the hypnotism and the fulfilment of the act suggested has been several weeks; in one carefully recorded case an act commanded on August 2 was performed on the following 2nd of October; and in another, equally authentic, an hallucination appeared 172 days after it had been suggested. Or the patient may be commanded to fall into the hypnotic sleep: the cases in which persons have been mesmerised at a distance, or by means of an amulet, come under this category, whereby some of the most wonderful effects of the mesmeric power are explained. The power of influencing the mind after the hypnotic sleep is over has been employed in a more satisfactory manner. Habits of intoxication have been combated by French and Swiss physicians, and, by an English clergyman, by suggesting a dislike of alcohol, with some success, and other habits will occur to the experienced which might be treated in the same manner. Its use has been proposed in education, and one case has been recorded of an idle boy who, being hypnotised and told to work, applied himself to his lessons, and could only escape from the necessity of so doing by refusing to be hypnotised again! For all these commands only operate for a time, and if the hypnotism is not repeated in a week or two the influence of the last *séance* wears out. A more obvious application of hypnotic suggestion is in the treatment of many diseases, which has been carried out on a large scale at Nancy, and with undoubted success in the case of many nervous diseases.

It is exceedingly difficult to offer any satisfactory explanation of post-hypnotic suggestions, especially those *à longue échéance*. I think M. Delbœuf's the only plausible one. He found that, if the subject be roused before such suggested acts or hallucinations are completed, there is a confused remembrance of them, as of a dream; while if they be finished they are not remembered.\* This leads him to suppose that the subject is for the

---

\* It is fair to say that Mr. Gurney thought this due to some peculiarity in M. Delbœuf's subjects.

time being thrown into a state of hypnotic trance, during which the suggestion takes effect.

We now come to consider whether there are any limits to a power which seems at first sight boundless, for good or ill as the operator may choose. It is generally admitted that all the more difficult and complicated suggestions, especially post-hypnotic ones à *longue échéance*, are usually not to be obtained from a subject at first, but require practice, and, as it were, gradual training. This is, however, not always the case. M. Déjerine, for instance, in the paper I have already quoted, says that he has observed two young men, who had never been hypnotised, in whom he could produce all the more complicated phenomena by simple suggestion. And there is a well-known case where a vagrant, named Castellan, in 1865, hypnotised a young girl in Provence, and used the influence he thus acquired over her to make her leave at once her father's house and live with him, though she looked on him with fear and loathing.

The mind of the subject introduces still more important limits to the power of the operator. For when I said that the former is an automaton in the hands of the hypnotiser, I must not be taken to mean that his or her faculties are entirely abolished for the time being. We see this in the ingenuity often displayed in selecting means for carrying out some end which has been determined beforehand by the operator. Thus a woman has had recourse to cajolery and ingenious excuses to induce a supposed victim to drink what she thinks to be a poisoned draught. Such subjects carry out the Calvinist view of free-will, believing themselves to be free, whereas they are simply executing the mandates of a will other than their own. The Nancy school believe that this is true of all subjects—that in the end none can escape the influence of suggestion, and that opposition can always be overborne by stronger pressure on the part of the operator, or removed by gradual training and practice. On the contrary, the Salpêtrière school have gradually come to the conclusion that the power of resistance to suggestions, though weakened, is not entirely lost. They appeal to numerous instances in which a subject has refused to perform an act which is opposed to his or her conscience, habits, or even inclinations. It is true that such resistance can often be overcome by persistence on the part of the operator, and his ascendancy grows with habit, but a margin of independence remains. Thus a woman, on being told to steal, refuses, either from moral motives or for fear of detection; or another, on being ordered to murder some one, replies, "Why should I? He has done me no harm." In such a case persistence brings on an attack of hysteria, and ends the *séance*. Indeed, the Paris school go farther, and say that they believe the

apparently criminal suggestions made only succeed because in their inmost hearts the subjects know that these are never seriously intended to be carried out; that they know the stabbing is only to be done with a paper-knife, the pistol is not loaded with ball, or the supposed arsenic is really sugar. It would require a much more extended and practical knowledge of the facts than I possess to decide between these two statements. But, looking on the question as an outsider, I remark chiefly these two points: On the one hand, many of the independent observers who follow the Nancy school in other respects, consider that in this they exaggerate the power of suggestion. On the other hand, it is hard to believe that all the apparent resistance and final consent to some act which revolts the moral sense or the inclinations is mere acting. Perhaps we shall do best to suspend our judgment, and meanwhile to hold that at any rate only a very small proportion of hypnotised subjects lose all power of resistance. It is unfortunate that there should be this conflict of opinion concerning the most important practical question of all, but the doubt will probably not greatly affect either way a decision as to the lawfulness of hypnotism in any given case.

Even this very slight sketch of hypnotism will be enough to show what a light it throws on some of the most obscure recesses of human life. I will only remark in passing on its analogies to the preternatural phenomena, possession, obsession, and the like; this is not the place, nor am I the person, to dwell on them farther.

The power of hypnotic suggestion shades away into the influence that strong minds have to carry away weaker ones: an influence that has long been recognised, both as regards individuals and masses of men. And, on another side, the fatality with which hallucinations and acts can be suggested to hypnotised subjects, their latency in the mind until aroused, and the oppression which subjects feel until the act is performed, all bear a striking resemblance to the irresistible impulses and fixed ideas which are sometimes met with in persons of otherwise sound mind.

The foregoing is a very brief account of the views at present entertained as to the nature and power of hypnotism. The practical questions raised by the existence of such an influence are, as will be seen on reflection, of the gravest importance. Some of them concern the administration of justice, and these may be studied by all who desire in the exhaustive work of M. Gilles de la Tourette,\* which is recognised as the chief autho-

---

\* "L'Hypnotisme et les états analogues au point de vue médico-légal."  
2me édition. Paris. 1889.

riety on the subject. It has to be borne in mind that the author belongs to the Paris school, and allowance has to be made for this, but his views as to the nature of hypnotism do not affect the value of the collected instances in which this has in one way or another come before the French tribunals. The point that has been most frequently raised is the obvious one: the possibility of the commission of criminal assaults during the hypnotic stupor, or as the result of suggestion in somnambulism. This is complicated by the difficulty of excluding simulation or false accusations, which are so common in such cases, so that some of the most intricate problems may be brought in this way before a court of justice. The forensic bearing of post-hypnotic suggestion is, at first sight, more alarming. To take only a few instances: subjects have been made to sign cheques for large amounts, or give receipts for money they have never had, as results of suggestions during somnambulism. Or, again, the subornation of testimony has been suggested experimentally in France with complete success. A theft has been suggested to a woman, and at the same time she has been supplied with a story which would cast the blame on some one else. After committing the theft, she has been brought before a sham "Juge d'Instruction," to whom she has accurately repeated the story prepared for her. The same end might be even more ingeniously attained, if, instead of mere false witness, an hallucination were suggested which should lead the subject to believe that he had seen an innocent person commit, or had himself committed, some crime. Finally, M. Binet has thought it by no means unlikely that criminals may hereafter employ the fearlessness and dexterity of somnambulists by hypnotising one of their number when any difficult feat has to be executed.

It is comforting to find M. de la Tourette considers the risks to society from the criminal applications of hypnotism are much less than we might at first sight expect. As a disciple of M. Charcot, he believes that suggestions can be always rejected by the moral sense or fear of the subject. He also points out that it would be practically impossible for an operator to hypnotise any one repeatedly—as is ordinarily required to gain an influence over the subject—without the knowledge of other persons, who could prove the relation between the two. The subornation of false witness would probably be easily exposed on cross-examination, by showing that the subject could not go beyond the lesson he had been taught by the hypnotiser. Even the greatest danger of all—the commission of criminal assaults during lethargy—is to some extent lessened by the fact that subjects often remember what has passed during that condition, though they may have been powerless, and to all appearance unconscious.

The legal responsibility of persons hypnotised has received much attention from French and Italian jurists. Some have thought that they should be treated as wholly or partially irresponsible; but the majority hold that they should fall under the legal provisions made for criminal lunatics. They urge that one who can be readily hypnotised, and accepts suggestions when in that state, is a permanent danger to society, because he can be so easily utilised for criminal purposes; and that the fear of punishment would make him refuse to be operated upon. Further, it seems reasonable that any one who allowed himself to be hypnotised, knowing the probable consequences, should be held responsible before the law, as much as one who commits a crime when intoxicated.

All who have had any experience of hypnotism are agreed in condemning the public exhibitions of electro-biology, mesmerism, animal magnetism, or whatever else they may be called. They are attended with considerable danger to the health and reason of the unfortunate persons experimented on by those who are, for the most part, quite unable to judge of the powerful nature of the agent they are employing, and whose only object is to produce startling and violent results. Even spectators who have only assisted at these brutalising exhibitions have been known to suffer from the impression made upon them; and others have received more permanent injury from the attempts to experiment at home which have been suggested by witnessing the results of a public *séance*. Such exhibitions are already prohibited in Italy, Austria, and, I believe, in Germany and Belgium. Until the same is done here, it seems to me the duty of all to abstain from countenancing by their presence such demoralising performances. It is also, I think, almost unanimously held by experts that hypnotism should not be employed, even by those qualified to use it with as little risk as possible, without some adequate reason, for mere purposes of study or idle curiosity. Beyond this point, the strongest differences of opinion exist. These were brought out very decidedly by the discussion on hypnotism which took place during the meeting of the British Medical Association at Birmingham last summer. Dr. Norman Kerr, who opened the discussion in an impassioned and somewhat rhetorical speech, contended that hypnotism was a morbid condition which should in no circumstances be produced; that its abuse was inseparable from its use, so that the results were always injurious; and that even when it succeeded in checking habits of intoxication, it did so by substituting a "teetotal drunkenness," which was far worse. I do not perceive that any facts were brought forward in support of this unsparing condemnation, which was based on general and abstract grounds. The sense of the meeting was adverse to Dr. Kerr's contention, and a committee of investigation

was appointed to study the whole subject. I have no desire to go beyond the scope of my present article, and to do more than endeavour to supply moralists with materials for coming to a conclusion on this subject; but I will add a few practical suggestions which will at any rate minimise the dangers of hypnotism, supposing the practice be considered lawful. The patient should be made to understand fully that it is a natural process, but one of a delicate character, which requires the same precautions as most other powerful methods of treatment. The operator should always be a trained hypnotiser, and a third party should always be present. It is important, that before awakening the subject, he should be told not to allow himself to be hypnotised by any one else, as this suggestion makes it very difficult for any other unauthorised person to hypnotise him, in case the attempt should ever be made. A sufficient interval should be interposed between each *séance* to prevent the formation of a habit of seeking to be hypnotised without good reason. This craving for a repetition of the process; the increased facility with which a subject can be affected; and a dependence, full of risk, of the patient upon the operator, are the principal dangers that would have to be guarded against. If the practice is ever permitted, most of these points have been very clearly and satisfactorily dealt with by the Abbé Trotin, a Professor in the Theological Faculty of Lille, in a pamphlet which was noticed in this REVIEW when it appeared.\* I would refer any reader who wishes to see the subject treated from a theological standpoint to its pages, and will only here add that the author is decidedly of opinion that hypnotism, under suitable precautions, is lawful.

The above account of hypnotism has been necessarily a very incomplete one. I have brought forward only what seem to me the most important points, and have set aside a large mass of very interesting detail. I trust I have at any rate expressed with sufficient clearness the general impression which a study of the subject has left on my own mind. This is in the main a reassuring one. At first sight the dangers of hypnotism seem so great that the temptation is to exaggerate them; but further consideration reduces them to human proportions, and teaches us they may be controlled. In almost all, if not in all, cases, the free-will of man remains a fortress impregnable to this as to every other external agency, unless the gate be opened by consent to the process, or a feeble resistance be offered by the will to suggestions after an entrance has been effected.

J. R. GASQUET.

---

\* "Étude Morale sur L'Hypnotisme." Lille, 1888. DUBLIN REVIEW, July 1888, p. 222.



## ART. II.—THE SCHOLASTIC MOVEMENT AND CATHOLIC PHILOSOPHY.\*

CATHOLIC philosophy is such a vital matter at the present time that I need make no excuse for offering a few remarks on it to the members of the Academia. And as it is a very large subject, and my time and space are necessarily limited, I need not hesitate in going at once and without preamble to a practical question in its regard, which is probably in the minds of many of us.

It is, I say, a very practical question to all of us who are interested in Catholic education, to adjust the claims of the mediæval scholastic philosophy, of which we have been authoritatively reminded by the present Pope, to the claims of the methods and substance of advancing thought. We cannot be neutral in face of contemporary intellectual movements. We shall not, if we are wise, put aside the thoughts of the great modern thinkers of Germany and of these islands as of no account. Exaggeration has been said to provoke reaction, and undue contempt for these philosophers may well be followed by too great deference to them. Both the thinkers and their thoughts have a claim on our attention. Yet the schoolmen, who wrote in a different stage of the history of philosophy, often deal slightly, or not at all, with subjects which occupy a large space in their writings.

The details of the evolution theory, and its bearing especially on man's moral nature, the external world controversy, as conceived from Descartes onwards, and resting in the first instance on scrutiny by the individual of the limits of his knowing power, the analysis of the sense of moral obligation as a phenomenon—these and similar questions loom large and important in the thought of the present hour, and they are touched slightly, or in some cases not at all, by scholastic writers. How, then, are we to combine the study of the philosophy of St. Thomas with the duty of taking our part in contemporary philosophy; with asserting the power of Catholics to hold their own in current psychology and ethics, as well as in current biology and astronomy; with giving continued evidence that the Church's respect for tradition and authority is in no way contrary to true intellectual liberty, or injurious to intellectual vitality, but serves in the main only to discipline our thought and restrain it from license—to perform the functions of drill-master and not of prison-warder?

---

\* This paper was read before the Academia of the Catholic Religion, at Archbishop's House, Westminster.

Perhaps the lines on which the problem is to be solved will be to some extent suggested by the consideration of certain characteristics of that age of Scholasticism to which we have been directed to turn our eyes. It is a very curious thing that incidentally the injunction to look for our guidance to the scholastic movement in its palmiest days, has, in certain minds, resulted in direct opposition to the first lesson which that movement teaches ;—that the conception of breadth, boldness, thoroughness in philosophy (which the age of St. Thomas pre-eminently exhibits) has by some been passed over in favour of the adoption of his phrases and opinions to the exclusion of his method. So far as Catholic thought has ever been comparatively free, unchecked, and uninterfered with by authority, it was at the time when Scholasticism, after considerable opposition on the part of the rulers of the Church, had become dominant. The most marked contrast between the tone of the Fathers and the tone of the schoolmen, is in the predominance among the latter of that dialectic, and the free exercise of that subtle logic, the dangers of which had been so strongly insisted on by the former. Free discussion was the life and soul of the schools—a danger no doubt unless kept in order by the high sanctity and reverence for Christian faith and tradition of its chief exponents, but still advocated and practised, with these safeguards, more unreservedly in the great epoch of full scholastic development, in the time of Alexander of Hales, of St. Thomas, of St. Bonaventure, than at any other.

The first distinctive note, then, of the scholastic period and the scholastic method is liberty—freedom of discussion.

Another note that strikes us—and it also bears on the question I am raising—is the change that came in with scholasticism in the attitude of Catholic thinkers towards the great philosophers who were external to the Catholic body. I am not forgetting the connection between the Neo-Platonic philosophy and Patristic Christianity, nor am I denying that here and there we find other pagan philosophers of antiquity treated with respect by the Christian Fathers, as by Justin Martyr, by Clement of Alexandria, by St. Augustine, by Origen ; but I am pointing out, what is acknowledged, that the respect shown to Plato and Aristotle among the scholastic philosophers as a body is of a very different order from the tone of the earlier Church in their regard. In patristic days, suspicion and opposition to them were quite as marked as sympathy with them ; whereas it is scarcely too much to say that among the later schoolmen respect and even reverence for them were almost universal. In the case of Aristotle the change is of course the most pronounced. But in the case of Plato it is also striking. One of the bitter reproaches which St. Bernard

made against Abelard, a hundred years before scholasticism finally prevailed, was his respect for the philosophers of ancient Greece. "O, second Aristotle," he exclaims in one letter, as the *ne plus ultra* of accusation in the matter of rationalism. And again he writes to Pope Innocent: "While he exhausts his strength to prove Plato a Christian he proves himself a heathen." \* "He puts forward philosophers with praise," he says in another letter, "and [by doing] so affronts the teachers of the Church." †

A third point which strikes one in looking at the great transition to Scholasticism in the thirteenth century is connected with that which I have just named. The Scholastics for the first time took up actively and systematically the philosophy of their own day, separated clearly the truths to be proved by reason and by revelation, regarded philosophy as a distinct science to be pursued, as any other science, by the light of reason alone. True, principles and conclusions at variance with faith were condemned; but in dealing with contemporary controversy on Metaphysics or Psychology, the light of reason alone was invoked; opponents were met on their own ground; the shyness which the Church had so long shown of philosophical studies, and of discussion, was put aside in the schools; the philosophical writings current among the non-Christians of that age, of the pantheist Averroes, of the Arabian Avicenna, of the Jew Maimonides, were read, and their theories debated. The complete works of Aristotle were studied, and his phrases and thoughts gradually found their way into the heart of Christian theology itself. The principle advocated by many of the Fathers that philosophy was dangerous to faith, and was to be avoided, was supplanted by an energetic and thorough study of the non-Christian thought of the time; by its refutation where it was opposed to Christianity; but on a far larger scale by the assimilation of the teaching of the autocrat of mediæval philosophy—Aristotle—with Catholic Dogma. ‡

Before considering somewhat more in detail these characteristics of the Scholastic movement let us read an eloquent description of the period given by Cardinal Newman in 1854 at Dublin:

[It] is the very age of universities; it is the classical period of the schoolmen; it is the splendid and palmary instance of the wise policy and large liberality of the Church, as regards philosophical inquiry. If there ever was a time when the intellect went wild and had a licentious revel, it was at the date I speak of. When was

\* "Life and Works of St. Bernard." Edited by Dom John Mabillon. Translated by Samuel Eales. London: J. Hodges. Vol. ii. p. 576.

† *Ibid.* p. 545.

‡ This point is brought out in a recently published anonymous pamphlet, edited by the Catholic writer, Dr. Dittrich, of Cologne.

there ever a more curious, more meddling, bolder, keener, more penetrating, more rationalistic exercise of the reason than at that time? What class of questions did that subtle, metaphysical spirit not scrutinise? What premiss was allowed without examination? What principle was not traced to its first origin, and exhibited in its most naked shape? What whole was not analysed? What complex idea was not elaborately traced out, and as it were finely painted for the contemplation of the mind, till it was spread out in all its minutest portions as perfectly and delicately as a frog's foot shows under the intense scrutiny of the microscope? . . . Did the Church take a high land with philosophy then? No, not though that philosophy was metaphysical. It was a time when she had temporal power, and could have exterminated the spirit of inquiry with fire and sword; but she determined to put it down by *argument*; she said: "Two can play at that, and my argument is the better." She sent her controversialists into the philosophical arena. It was the Dominican and Franciscan doctors, the greatest of them being St. Thomas, who in those mediæval Universities fought the battle of Revelation with the weapons of heathenism. It was no matter whose the weapon was; truth was truth all the world over. With the jawbone of an ass, with the skeleton philosophy of Pagan Greece, did the Samson of the schools put to flight his thousand Philistines.

Here observe the contrast exhibited between the Church herself, who has the gift of wisdom, and even the ablest, or wisest, or holiest of her children . . . the early Fathers [had] shown an extreme aversion to the great heathen philosopher whom I just now named, Aristotle. I do not know who of them could endure him; and when there arose those in the middle age who would take his part, especially since their intentions were of a suspicious character, a strenuous effort was made to banish him out of Christendom. The Church the while had kept silence; she had as little denounced heathen philosophy in the mass as she had pronounced upon the meaning of certain texts of Scripture of a cosmological character. From Tertullian and Caius to the two Gregories of Cappadocia, from them to Anastasius Sinaita, from him to the school of Paris, Aristotle was a word of offence; at length St. Thomas made him a hewer of wood and drawer of water to the Church. A strong slave he is; and the Church herself has given her sanction to the use in theology of the words and phrases of his philosophy."—*Idea of a University*, p. 470.

Such was the great change which the schoolmen of the age of St. Thomas introduced. On the whole, and in spite of incidental *rapprochements*, Christian thought and philosophy, properly so called, had been before the scholastic period separate streams. The Fathers were shy of dialectics. St. Ambrose's "non in dialectica complacuit Deo saluum facere populum suum," expressed a very widespread feeling in the early centuries.

Church authority was afraid of the tendency of pagan philosophy; it recognised plainly that the temper of mind fostered by philosophical study was opposed to the humility of faith. It was obvious that the Gospel which lay hid from the wise and learned and was revealed to little ones, which could only be fully accepted by those who became as little children, was naturally opposed to that study which is generally allowed to be specially connected with intellectual pride. And the opposition to free disputation, the opposition to philosophy, the fear of the great intellects of antiquity which so often appears among the Fathers—as Tertullian, St. Basil, St. Irenæus, St. Bernard—is readily understood in this connection. The typical patristic thinkers took their stand on the doctrine which had been handed down, on authority, on a tradition to be accepted in simplicity and docility: the advocates of the free dialectic advanced the claims of the intellect, pointed out that a wise man should not believe without sufficient reason, that reason is the highest faculty given to man, and that blind obedience may lead us to error as well as to truth. The tendency of the former line was no doubt—if uncorrected—to make men narrow, intellectually passive, timid, and unphilosophical; the tendency of the latter was to pride, shallowness, over-subtlety, neglect of the accumulated experience of the past. History repeats itself, and we see the same tendencies in our day among conservative and liberal thinkers on religion. One great work of the Scholastics seems to have been the attempt to unite and combine what was good in each tendency; to preserve the rights of authority and tradition, and to admit the rights of reason; to define clearly the former, and so to allow the freest scope for the latter outside the limits thus laid down. The claims of authority had *ever* been recognised by Christian doctors, and therefore so far as orthodox Catholic thought was concerned, the scholastic triumph was distinctly, as I said at starting, a step—and a great step—in the direction of intellectual freedom. But that freedom was tempered, as it ever must be in all Catholic thought, by the reverence which its advocates showed for the wisdom of the past, and the sense with which they were penetrated of the truths of revelation.

Perhaps we shall most clearly recall this characteristic of the work of St. Thomas and his immediate predecessors—Albertus and Alexander of Hales—by considering the position of affairs a century before his time. The distinctively intellectual movement had, no doubt, gained a footing before the Thomistic era among orthodox writers, such as Lanfranc and St. Anselm, but its dangers were conspicuously illustrated in the works of Abelard, and the traditional fear of its excesses found expression in the warnings of St. Bernard, and in the attitude of ecclesiastical

authority with regard to the study of Aristotle even as late as the thirteenth century itself. The argumentative treatment of the grounds of religious belief and of the mysteries of Faith which St. Thomas's genius and sanctity established as at once a true and safe way of dealing with them, seemed, as advocated by Abelard, an unmixed danger. In his letters, St. Bernard is never tired of protesting against the whole method. Abelard, no doubt, fell also into positive heresy; but the Saint's protests are by no means confined to his errors of doctrine. They are directed quite as much against his spirit and his method. "The hidden things of God are exposed," he writes to the *Roman Curia*, "questions about the most exalted truths are rashly ventilated, the Fathers are derided because they held that such things are to be tested rather than solved . . . human reason usurps for itself everything, and leaves nothing to faith. It tries things above it, tests things too strong for it, rushes into Divine things; holy subjects it rather forces open than unlocks, what is closed and sealed it rather plunders than opens, and whatever it finds out of its reach it holds to be of no account and disdains to believe."\* And, again, to the Archbishop of Reims he writes: "Peter Abelard is endeavouring to destroy the virtue of Christian Faith; inasmuch as he thinks that he is able to comprehend the whole that God is by the unaided reason, he is ascending to the skies, he is descending to the depths. There is nothing which can escape him either in the heights above or in the depths beneath. He is a great man in his own eyes, a disputer of faith against the faith . . . a prier into the majesty of God."† And again to Cardinal Guido: "He sees nothing through a glass darkly, but beholds all things face to face, and busies himself in great and wonderful matters above him."‡ And to Cardinal Haimeric: "He endeavours to scrutinise by the light of his reason alone, the mysteries which are apprehended by the pious mind only by the intuition of faith; the faith of the pious which believes and does not discuss . . . nor is he willing to believe anything unless he shall first have considered it by reason."§

The same fear of dialectic and philosophising, in connection with religious truth, is evident in such writers as Hildebert of Lavardin, Bishop of Tours, St. Bernard's contemporary. Dialectics, he said, were dangerous and vain, and opposed to the spirit of faith. Faith he defined as "that voluntary certitude of absent truths, which is to be placed above opinion, but below scientific knowledge." Coupled with the distrust and denunciation of disputation, we find constantly the accusation that the traditional doctrine

---

\* *Loc. cit.* p. 542.

† *Loc. cit.* p. 594.

‡ *Loc. cit.* p. 592.

§ *Loc. cit.* p. 871.



and the teaching of the Fathers is held to be of no account, and here we have undoubtedly the true *gravamen*. The opposition to current philosophical studies reached, perhaps, its highest point when Innocent III., through his Legate, forbade the French people in 1215 to read the works of Aristotle at all.

No doubt it was recognised even at this time that in such prohibitions more was concerned than the intrinsic truth and falsehood of the doctrines propounded. St. Bernard often speaks of the unsettling effect of such a way of treating these questions on the faith of the young, and of the dangers arising from novelty of phrase; and when Aristotle was forbidden, the prohibition was in part provoked by the unregulated discussion among untrained minds of Pantheistic interpretations of his teaching. But still the contrast I am speaking of remains—that up to the time of the victory of Scholasticism, dialectic and free disputation both in philosophy and in theology, both as to the intellectual basis of belief and its superstructure, were opposed in great measure by Saints and Church authorities, and that St. Thomas changed this policy and used them;—not, indeed, without opposition in his own time, but ultimately obtaining the very highest ecclesiastical sanction. St. Bernard opposed the full discussion of theological mystery; St. Thomas showed that it could be done safely and reverently with certain safeguards. St. Bernard spoke of respect for Aristotle and Plato as an insult to Christian faith; St. Thomas showed that a vast amount from the teaching of both could be assimilated with that faith, and could even assist in its exposition. Pope Innocent opposed the Pantheistic interpretations of Aristotle by forbidding the questions at issue to be pursued; St. Thomas opposed them by the very fullest discussion and refutation. St. Bernard saw in Abelard a natural opposition between the free exercise of the reason and the humility of faith; St. Thomas showed that faith need not fear reason, and that the freest reasoning, if combined with the spirit of faith, was admissible, and would help the cause of religious truth instead of injuring it.

The difference between the two spirits appears in the very outset of St. Thomas's *Summa*.\* Argumentation on theological mystery which was so distasteful to St. Bernard, is explicitly defended in the first *Quæstio*. St. Thomas asks how theology can be an argumentative science when it is concerned with faith, reminds us of St. Ambrose's saying, "*tolle argumenta ubi fides quæritur*," and then proceeds to explain the matter by mapping out an exact and systematic field for argument in theology. True, he says, revealed truth is to be the starting-point; but that once allowed, theology is argumentative just as other sciences are. Each

---

\* 1<sup>a</sup> 1<sup>o</sup> Q. I. Art. VIII.

science has its first principles, which are established from a previous science; and it argues freely from these principles. It does not dispute about them, because such dispute is the subject rather of the previous science. The first of all sciences is metaphysics, in which the principles are final; and if a man will not grant them you cannot dispute with him, as you have no common ground; though you can answer his objections to your conclusions. And theology is in this respect very much like metaphysics. The theologian does not attempt to argue with those who do not admit the authority of revelation, any more than the metaphysician can prove his system against those who deny its fundamental axioms; but in both cases argument is freely used (*a*) in reasoning from first principles, and (*b*) in answering objections to the conclusions of the science, and showing those conclusions to be not contrary to reason.

This frank recognition of the place of dialectic in dealing with religious mysteries is then one mark of the scholastic tone. Another is, as I have already said, the clear separation of truths to be proved by reason and truths to be known only by revelation. St. Thomas deals with this question at the beginning of the *Summa contra Gentiles* in a passage too well known to be worth citing. In both these respects St. Thomas was giving the weight of his authority to the distinction already marked out by the founder of Western Scholasticism, Scotus Erigena. The vague—perhaps, at times, too vague—protests of some of the Fathers against dealing by means of the reason with matters of faith, applying dialectic where spiritual tact is rather in place, and indulging curiosity and private judgment where obedience to authority is rather called for, gave place to the precise distinction—perhaps too precise to deal quite accurately with so large a subject—between the province of reason and the province of authority. "All authority," wrote Erigena, "has proceeded from true reason, but by no means reason from authority. All authority which is not approved by true reason appears to be weak; but true reason since it remains unchanged, fortified and ratified by its own strength, requires to be strengthened by no pledge of authority." Yet he adds, and so guards himself from the imputation of rationalism, "nothing is more fittingly proved by true reason than the authority of the holy Fathers, which is probable and unshaken." These two points, the defining clearly the provinces of reason, authority, and the encouragement within limits of the argumentative and dialectic tendencies, formed the basis, as is well known, of the mediæval disputations, and resulted in a freedom of discussion and speculation, as Cardinal Newman points out, unparalleled in the history of Christendom.

And this naturally leads to the remaining mark of Scholasticism

of which I have spoken ; its liberal attitude towards non-Catholic philosophy. Instead of fearing it and expelling it as so many of the Fathers did, the great schoolmen threw themselves into contemporary controversy, accepted and even revered much of the non-Catholic teaching, did full justice to it, adopted much, confuted much. We need not remind ourselves that to St. Thomas Aristotle—the bugbear of so many of the Fathers—is the “ philosopher ” *par excellence*. Albertus Magnus follows in part with respect and sympathy the teaching of Maimonides the Jew. The same great scholastic thinker uses the Arabian Avicenna in great measure as his guide in the interpretation of Aristotle. Both he and still more St. Thomas criticise closely the doctrine of the pantheist Averroes and confute him in detail. Plato as well as Aristotle is a great authority with them.

It may be worth while to recall these characteristics of the school of St. Thomas in relation to the age in which he lived, and to the non-Catholic systems and thinkers who possessed intellectual influence in that age, as it helps us to realise what the scholastic movement ought to mean and did mean in the hands of its greatest exponents, and what it does not mean. The present Holy Father in the Encyclical *Æterni Patris* particularly guarded himself against recommending an exact return to the letter of scholastic dissertations, and in a memorable passage marked off the “ wisdom of St. Thomas,” which he was extolling, from any such barren learning by rote of obsolete discussions. “ We say,” he wrote, “ the wisdom of St. Thomas ; for it is not by any means in our mind to set before this age as a standard those things which may have been inquired into by scholastic doctors with too great subtlety ; or anything taught by them with too little consideration, not agreeing with the investigations of a later age ; or, lastly, anything that is not probable.” And it was a conspicuous part of the “ wisdom of St. Thomas ” that he did keep his mind open to the thought of his day, and did not ignore the investigations of a later age, or teach “ with too little consideration ” what in view of the progress of thought in his time was “ not probable.”

Now to attempt to apply St. Thomas’ *via media* to the conditions of our own day. St. Thomas, as we have said, by emphasising his adhesion to patristic tradition as to matters essential to Christian doctrine, and marking out the sphere of authority, rendered for the first time possible that freedom of discussion which is required for the progress of philosophical science. Free thought had been proscribed because it had overstepped its lawful province ; but that province having been clearly marked out, it was, in its allotted sphere, entirely compatible with Catholic obedience. And hence an absolute revolution in

Christian philosophy became possible, without the slightest detriment to Christian faith. St. Thomas marks the point at which the Church made the most far-reaching concession to the non-Christian thought of the day which is to be found in her history. The claims of Aristotelianism hitherto resisted were allowed; and the form of Catholic teaching, philosophical and even theological, was from that period onwards changed. The Aristotelian method and philosophy were adopted by Catholics, as they had been by the Jewish and Arabian schools, and reconciled by us, as by them, with traditional religious teaching. It was a victory by surrender. St. Thomas surrendered what was unessential—the philosophical and theological method and form—to ensure what was essential, that the influence of current philosophy should be compatible with acceptance of patristic tradition and Christian faith. And thus to couple the warning in the papal encyclical to remember Catholic traditional philosophy in all its stages, with special reference to the name of St. Thomas, is to remind us how that tradition may be guarded, and yet the most fearless acceptance of what is good in non-Catholic thought, and discussion of its various aspects good and bad alike, be allowed. It suggests by analogy that the fundamental principles of Christian Scholasticism will only derive new strength and greater exactness of expression from further development, analysis, and illustration in the light of the living thought of the present time.

Let us now attempt to suggest one or two practical details in which the general principles brought before us by St. Thomas's work may be applied. I will confine myself to two points—namely, (a) the possibility of preserving old principles while modifying the form of expression, and changing the proportion of attention given to particular philosophical problems; (b) the attitude observed by St. Thomas in relation to the non-Catholic speculation of his time.

On the first point, let it be noted that the whole subject-matter of Aristotle's elaborate metaphysics was new to Christendom in the age of St. Thomas. Abelard, a century earlier, enthusiastic admirer though he was of Aristotle, knew only his logic and certain dialectical works. When we reflect that the subjects chosen by St. Thomas for discussion were in very large measure on the questions peculiar to the peripatetic Metaphysics, we realise something of the magnitude of the change which he introduced in this respect. Then again the terminology of the Aristotelian philosophy was especially marked; and it was a terminology almost unknown to the Fathers, and in great part unknown to the earlier schoolmen. And its admission was the adoption, for the sake of assimilating contemporary thought, of a phraseology which had certainly been

considered pantheistic, and which the best critics consider to have been intended by Aristotle himself as pantheistic. Even a writer so sympathetic with the schoolmen as Father Stoekl, when discussing Aristotle's conception of the *νοῦς* in its relation with the *ψύχη*, does not undertake to decide the matter in favour of the Christian explanation of his meaning.

Surely St. Thomas's power of preserving, and expressing with greater depth and precision the principles of Christian philosophy, and yet combining them with such extensive modifications to suit the needs of contemporary thought, is very remarkable and suggestive. And we have in the same strain the weighty words of the greatest Scholastic of our own times, Father Kleutgen: "The scholastic philosophy," he writes, "as a whole is susceptible of noteworthy improvements, nay, from the circumstances of the time it needs them; insomuch that in this sense it may be superseded by a better philosophy. . . . We have never asserted that all questions now raised were solved in times past; nor have we ever expressed a doubt that for their solution the ancient Philosophy might derive advantage from the modern. That which we do deny is that in order to perfect philosophical science it is necessary to deny the fundamental principles of antiquity."\*

It seems then in accordance with the action of St. Thomas in reference to his own day, and not out of accord with Father Kleutgen's own view of the philosophical necessities of our time, to modify in great measure the actual subjects treated by the old Scholastics, and to adapt philosophical terminology to the custom of the day. Much of the Aristotelian metaphysics was dwelt on at length because it was the subject of which the mediæval mind was full; and just so far its proportion naturally dwindles as it becomes foreign to the thought of our own time. On the other hand, such questions as the analysis of moral obligation, the evolution of the moral idea, the external world controversy, the part played by intellect and sense in our knowledge, assume large proportions in contemporary thought; and it would seem in accord with St. Thomas's action to give the fullest attention to them, and to their solution on the lines of the traditional Christian philosophy, and in the language which the problems themselves have incidentally created. Earnest thinkers of all kinds, who have traced the ethical controversy in England from the days of Hobbes and Cudworth to those of Herbert Spencer and Martineau, need the light which might be thrown on their controversies by the best Catholic thought. On the other hand, admirable as is the Thomistic analysis of the

---

\* "La Philosophie Scholastique," vol. ii. p. 256.

*Synderesis*, and the *Conscientia*, and the *Lex Naturalis*, the proportion occupied by such matters in St. Thomas's own writings is comparatively small. What St. Thomas did in applying and expounding the best patristic thought to solve the questions raised by mediæval Aristotelianism, the Catholic philosopher has now to do in expounding St. Thomas's principles, and applying them to these great modern controversies of which I have spoken. He will at the outset of the dispute put his finger on the divergence between Hobbes's egoistic utilitarianism and the Thomistic rational morality, and will thus be started on the right lines; and as he pursues the subject he will find many questions raised of which St. Thomas had not thought, and which require to be answered, but which will only deepen his sense of the absolute necessity throughout of conceiving of morality, as St. Thomas does, as something generically distinct from the happiness it brings (though this is often important as a criterion of the material morality of acts)—and as founded in the last resort on God's Eternal Law of which a portion is placed within the apprehension of man's rational nature. And I am encouraged to speak of this as a suitable form of Catholic philosophy, with respect to problems of deep contemporary interest, by the fact that the programme I am indicating has been recently carried out with signal success by an English Jesuit, Father Maher, in his very able work on *Psychology*.\* He emphasises both points—the necessity of observing the historical development of an idea in controversy, and of criticism from the standpoint of Catholic principles at each stage. "I have been led," he writes, "to introduce so much historical matter, partly by the general aim of the work—the interpretation or solution of new problems by means of old principles, partly because experience has assured me that the history of a dispute is, as a rule, the easiest, as well as the most interesting way of enabling a student to attain a clear comprehension of the point at issue; and partly because I am convinced that the chronological development of a theory is a most thorough test of the value of the principles from which it started . . . my exposition throughout is accompanied by criticism, and my constant aim has been to exhibit counter-hypotheses in such a manner as to bring out clearly the true doctrine." Such is Father Maher's purpose, and he carries it out with thorough success. And his success is instructive and encouraging to those who see the danger lest St. Thomas's method of active philosophising on questions of the day should be abandoned in favour of the mere acquirement by rote of the details of an over-subtle metaphysical speculation which has ceased to be a living force. Father Maher

\* "*Psychology*." By M. Maher, S.J., M.A. Stonyhurst Series. Macmillan & Co.



treats in the same spirit, at once real and in the best sense liberal in thought and reverent to Christian tradition, other problems besides the ethical—the great controversies on the external world, and on the sensible and intellectual elements in cognition.

The second point to which I have referred is equally important; and here, perhaps, Father Maher is somewhat less liberal than his master, St. Thomas, or St. Thomas's master, Albertus Magnus—I mean the question as to the attitude of the Catholic philosopher towards non-Catholic thought. It cannot too often be insisted on—as showing the conception of philosophy entertained by the great mediæval scholastics—that the man whom they revered as the greatest of thinkers was a pagan; that they were so anxious to use his great thoughts for the service of Christianity that they took infinite pains to surround his teaching with Christian associations, and preferred to use forced interpretations of his meaning, rather than weaken his authority by admitting the Antichristian drift which portions of it appear to have. And the same careful study, partly in approval, partly in criticism, marks, as we have seen, the attitude of St. Thomas and Albertus towards the Arabian and Jewish thinkers of their time. The general fear and avoidance of non-Christian philosophy, which no doubt was not without good reason in earlier days, had given place to close study and criticism. Let it be noted parenthetically that both attitudes are in their measure reasonable, and in limits necessary, but from different points of view, and in different circumstances. The one is the attitude of Christian rulers or pastors, the other of Christian philosophers. The pastor and ruler looks to the weak brethren, and sees the danger of subtle and deep questions being raised and disputed about in the presence of the young, or the illiterate, or the half-educated. St. Bernard's remonstrance against Abelard's free disputation and advocacy of pagan teaching are greatly based on this. "Not only in the schools," he writes to Pope Innocent, "but in the roads and public places, disputes are carried on about the Holy Trinity and the nature of God, and that not only among learned and passably instructed persons, but among children even, and simple and ignorant persons." And again, to Cardinal Stephen he writes: "Scarcely has (Abelard) separated his young and unskilled scholars from the rudiments of dialectic, than he introduces those who are as yet barely able to comprehend the rudiments of the Faith to the mystery of the Holy Trinity, the Holy of Holies, the very chamber of the King, and even to him who makes darkness his dwelling-place." And he speaks in the same strain to many others.

This attitude of caution and sense of the dangers of discussion, and its tendency to unsettle immature minds, is clearly necessary

in a measure for our rulers and pastors, though such dangers are greater at one time and less at another. It may be, perhaps, at a critical juncture their business to proscribe philosophising altogether. A recent and saintly Catholic thinker has maintained that the narrowing of Catholic thought since the Reformation has been owing to a duty of this kind. Private judgment had run wild, and the idea of authority was thrown to the winds by Luther and his followers. A stern enforcement of authority became necessary to neutralise the danger. No matter if the intellectual life in the Church did suffer for the time. A more important interest was at stake—Catholic faith itself. Authority became more absolute, more stringent. A liberty at other times allowable, and even essential for vigour and life, became dangerous. As martial law supersedes, in time of rebellion, the freer process of trial by jury, and other institutions essential to the rightful liberties of a people in a state of peace, so the necessary vindication of authority after the Reformation, contracted and repressed the freedom of Catholic thought and speculation which characterised the Middle Ages. Authoritative suppression of opinion became more necessary, lest a liberty, at other times desirable, should under the peculiar circumstances degenerate into license. But this interference with speculation, however necessary, naturally checks the ardour of a philosophical movement, and may even render philosophical thought impossible. And in the palmy days of mediæval philosophy, though the danger of scandalising the weak was not forgotten, and the great masters of the second period of Scholasticism were not accused, as Abelard had been, of unsettling young men by startling and dangerous disputations, it was recognised that in the sphere of philosophy, careful, dispassionate, and in great measure sympathetic study of all great thinkers was called for. It was not desirable for all. All men were not required to be philosophers. The minds of many would only be upset by a task beyond their intellectual strength. And, again, at all times this development of philosophy must be in the hands of teachers and not of learners. It was to men whose life-work was philosophical thought—as St. Thomas and Albertus Magnus—that the task naturally fell of adjusting the relations of Christian philosophy to the Jewish, Arabian, and Pagan schools. Such a task would have been impossible to half-trained minds, and to attempt it would have been full of danger. But now, as then, if a Catholic philosophy is to flourish, this process of its adjustment to non-Catholic thought must take place—not, indeed, in organs of ephemeral controversy, but in those works in which philosophical teachers will naturally express themselves. A true philosophy cannot identify itself with the unphilosophical measure of mere proscription. Rulers may proscribe. The philosopher's

business is in his own sphere to consider candidly, to discuss, to refute what is false, to accept what is true.

And at the present time, now that comparative peace is supervening after the struggle of the Reformation, and spiritual rebellion has resolved its elements into renewed obedience in some, and hereditary separation in others, now that the suspended commerce of intellect is being resumed, and the institutions essential for a flourishing community in time of peace are again coming into play, now that English Catholics have their civil and political rights in a measure restored, have their hierarchy re-established, are making themselves felt in the great social movements of the day, are recognising who are their friends outside the visible fold in these movements, are surmounting the indiscriminate sense that every man's hand is against them in the world of politics and society, we naturally have to look more exactly in the intellectual sphere, as well as in other spheres, at non-Catholic writers and their principles. Intellectual life becomes possible for us as political life, and social life. In the absence of philosophical organisation—at such times as I have referred to—our rulers may warn us against false prophets, against Kant, against Locke, against the Scottish school,—as well as against thinkers whose principles are anti-religious,—as out of accord, in much or in little, with the principles of the Church. A wholesale flight is the only course when the weapons and resources of philosophy have been removed. But when the ruler's martial law is revoked, and arms are once more allowed, and Catholic philosophy is called upon to deal with the matter, it must separate the wheat from the chaff. It condemns Kant's theoretical scepticism, but it recognises in his pages probably some of the deepest thoughts which the intellect of man has wrought out on the great principles of ethics. It treats him as St. Thomas treated Aristotle—interprets him for the best, claims his support where it can, examines him closely, parts company with him where he is clearly at variance with Catholic truth, but reverences him intellectually, and recognises that his great thoughts, as all great thoughts, come from God. And so with our great English and Scotch thinkers, Reid, Dugald Stewart, Bishop Butler, Dr. Martineau,\* Catholic philosophy does not treat them as enemies, but it considers closely what they say, and welcomes the good, and examines and corrects what is

---

\* I have chosen these names as representing thinkers who have conferred great benefits on true philosophy, although their teaching is not entirely in accord with scholastic ethics. It is perhaps important to remember that such writers have done more than any Catholic towards the refutation of the Utilitarian philosophy represented in our own day by Mill and Spencer.

inaccurate. The great fact that in the exercise of purely philosophical thought a non-Christian intellect may be supreme, and far superior to his Christian commentators, was emphasised once and for ever by the schoolmen, and to forget it is to forget a cardinal point in their teaching.

To express briefly the practical conclusion towards which these remarks tend: there appear to be two conceptions of the direction which the Catholic philosophical movement should take. One tends rather to fall back on the scholastic phraseology, to devote its principal attention to the identical questions which St. Thomas had to deal with in contemporary Aristotelianism, to view modern thinkers, so to speak, at a distance, as enemies on the whole, to be read hastily, for the purpose of refutation; nervously, half in fear lest to read them carefully and fully will be to shake Christian faith, wholly in fear of adopting in any considerable degree opinions first advocated by thinkers outside the Church. The same view is inclined to regard contemporary philosophical movements as something quite external to us, and radically vicious, to be compared (more in their conclusions than in their trains of thought which are not entered into) with individual scholastic conclusions, and where they differ to be considered simply false while the scholastic conclusions are held to be simply true. Such I say is a not uncommon view observable among Catholic writers. But there is another view more or less prevalent in the writings of such thinkers as Father Maher, and which falls in with the general account of the history of Catholic thought given by Father Hecker. And I have attempted to point out that the lesson to be learnt by studying the attitude of St. Thomas towards contemporary thought in his own day is far more in accord with this latter view. That an attitude of general hostility to and avoidance of non-Catholic thinkers may be indeed as a political and social policy wise under given circumstances, I have not denied. But at those times and places, in which the Church encourages philosophical thinking and study such an attitude is out of place, as being destructive of philosophy; and the first systematic philosophy which the Church adopted held on high a diametrically opposite policy in their regard. St. Thomas's example in this matter should teach Catholic writers not to give their chief attention to questions foreign to contemporary thought, but to questions which occupy the mind of the age; not to adhere jealously to phrases and forms of the past, but to be ready, as he was, to assimilate modes of speaking and thinking which we find in use, clothing old principles if needs be in a new dress; not to be shy of great thinkers, because they are not Catholics or even Christians, but to treat them in that calm, kindly, candid, and philosophical spirit in which he and his greatest fellow-scholastics

treated Aristotle, Plato, Avicenna, and Maimonides ; not to fear a great thought, or a happy solution of a contemporary controversy, because the thinker who first expressed it was not a Catholic ; not to hesitate, if philosophy is our vocation, to study fully, carefully, dispassionately all sides of crucial problems and discussions ; to be quite prepared to find a great movement of modern thought outside the Church as compatible with the faith which is handed down to us as portions of the philosophy of the Neo-Platonists were with the teaching of St. Augustine, and the essential features of Aristotelianism with that of St. Thomas ; not to view tentative expressions of even the greatest Catholic thinkers as final analyses of philosophical truth. Such expressions, as supplying the answer to particular questions proper to a given time, which naturally lead in due course to further questions, must necessarily, while the human mind is what it is, be somewhat incomplete. In the science of ethics the sympathetic study of such writers as Kant, Bishop Butler, or Dr. Martineau, gives far greater help in expressing exactly, with reference to the Utilitarian controversy, the principles of the intuitionist morality, than can possibly be supplied by the writings of the schoolmen, to whom the problem was in part unknown.

This general view of Catholic philosophy makes possible an intellectual life in the present ; the other view makes speculative thought pass into archæological study ; or at best leads us to view the drama of past intellectual movements as spectators, in place of living a life of thought of our own as actors in the great battle of philosophy.

WILFRID WARD.



### ART. III.—THE POPE AND CATHOLIC PHILOSOPHY IN ENGLAND.

**D**URING the month of January of the present year there appeared in the columns of *The Tablet* a letter from His Holiness to the Bishop of Salford on the subject of "Catholic Philosophy at the English Catholic Colleges." Along with that of the Pope there was published a letter from the Bishop of Salford to the Rector of Stonyhurst, commenting on the former. As we fear that these letters did not attract at the time the attention which a subject of such first-rate importance deserves, we purpose in the present article to discuss the matter at some length.

The immediate occasion of the Holy Father's letter seems to have been an account furnished to him by the Bishop of Salford, describing the efforts which have been made in recent years by the authorities at Stonyhurst College to provide there a sound course of Catholic Philosophy for the lay students who follow the higher studies, and also mentioning the steps taken at Ushaw to secure to the students there a course of lectures from Mr. Wilfrid Ward on "Modern Philosophy." It is well known, since the first years of his Pontificate, what a deep interest the present Pope takes in the subject of philosophy. We ourselves do not believe it rash to prophesy that the future historian of the Church will single out as among the most important events of Leo the Thirteenth's reign the great revival of scholastic philosophy, which received so powerful a stimulus from the celebrated Encyclical, *Æterni Patris*, of 1879.

The object of the Encyclical of 1879 was to impress on the Bishops and Patriarchs of the universal Church, on the Superiors of the religious Orders, on the authorities entrusted with the government of Catholic schools of theology and philosophy, on the professors holding chairs in these faculties, and on the faithful at large, the vital want at the present time of a more universal and more thorough study of philosophy; and especially the necessity of unity of doctrine, to be brought about by the general adoption of the teaching of St. Thomas Aquinas. It will naturally take a generation or two to reveal the full force of the impetus given to the study of scholastic philosophy by that document; but, even within the twelve years that have already elapsed there have appeared many encouraging proofs of its effect. The Holy Father himself was the first to take action by appointing a select committee of the best Catholic scholars to publish a new and magnificent edition of the works of the Angelic Doctor. A



large number of text-books, and several valuable treatises on particular branches of scholastic philosophy have since appeared in various countries on the Continent. The chairs of philosophy in Catholic hands throughout the world have become rapidly filled with professors who follow St. Thomas in no half-hearted manner. And there has been a large increase in the number of literary periodicals, of societies, of academies, and of other organisations specially devoted to the extension of the study of scholastic philosophy.

It is, too, a matter of some satisfaction to us that the recent letter of His Holiness affords evidence that even here in England the great Encyclical has already borne fruit. There is, indeed, much to be accomplished still; but there is encouragement in the fact that something has already been done, and that we are not altogether isolated from the great Catholic movement of philosophical revival on the Continent. His Holiness is able to congratulate us on the publication of a series of English philosophical text-books, and on the establishment in one of our leading colleges of a sound course of philosophy for Catholic laymen, and on the institution of a special series of lectures on modern philosophy in another. This circumstance justifies us in quoting the words of the Pope in his letter to Dr. Vaughan :

The great anxiety with which we turn our thoughts to the task of securing that the Catholic faith in England may day by day make greater advances, causes us to welcome with feelings of joy and thankfulness whatever work or pains, giving promise of great results, is bestowed on this subject. Hence you will easily understand, Venerable Brother, the pleasure we felt in what you lately reported to us about the College of Stonyhurst in your diocese—namely, that by the efforts of the Superiors of this College an excellent course of the exact sciences has been successfully set on foot, by establishing professorships, and by publishing in the vernacular for the use of their students, text-books of philosophy, following the principles of St. Thomas Aquinas. On this work we earnestly congratulate the Superiors and teachers of the College, and by this letter we wish affectionately to express our goodwill towards them. It has also been a great pleasure for us to hear what has been done in this way at the College of St. Cuthbert's, Ushaw, and we trust that what has been well begun may, by God's mercy, be happily carried through.

The consciousness that even a little progress has been made in the right direction not unfrequently constitutes a cheering stimulus to further efforts, and we may therefore reasonably feel gratified that some useful steps have already been accomplished.

Our present purpose, however, is not one of self-congratulation; on the contrary, our aim is to make clear how much remains to

be done, and of what extreme importance it is that this work should be well performed. Our desire is to show how necessary it is that a thorough grounding in the principles of the true philosophy should form an integral part in the higher education of English Catholic youth. Probably at no previous period did there await the young Catholic entering the world of life such serious dangers to his faith as at present. Probably, not even in the days of the early martyrs, were the assaults upon a Christian's loyalty to his belief of such a deadly character as they will be in the coming fifty years. The violence of persecution may for a while overwhelm the weak-kneed, and extort for a time external conformity and submission; but it also raises up grand examples of edification, heroes who, by their constancy through suffering, enkindle courage and zeal amongst their brethren, and by their prayers win great blessings for those who remain behind them. Apart, too, from the rich store of grace abundantly supplied at such epochs, there is something that appeals even to the natural man, and rouses the combative instincts in human nature to play a courageous part under the pressure of physical trial. The martyr, the confessor, and even the apostate felt that, however feeble he might himself be, the cause for which he had been called on to suffer was irresistible. The very fact of their being driven to appeal to force proved to him the inherent weakness of the persecutors' side.

In the present war against Christianity all this is changed. Instead of attack by open assault, the fortress is undermined, the confidence of the defenders in the strength and justice of their cause, and in the ability of their leaders, is slowly worn away, and their courage and vigour gradually destroyed by a subtle poison. The weapons of the enemy now are not the dungeon, the rack, or the lions of the Colosseum. They are arguments carefully forged by acute intellects. The struggle now is not with brute force, which may be despised, but with what claims to be human reason, which, unless its pretensions be exploded, will necessarily be revered. Instead of the encouraging example of heroes, who win before his eyes the martyr's crown, the Christian beholds, from time to time, the desertion of comrades who declare they have discovered that the cause for which they had been fighting is an illusion. Moreover, he feels that the foe is ever multiplying his forces. He cannot brace himself up for one heroic effort and finish the struggle, but from day to day must be subject to silent insidious attacks, the cumulative weight of which he often realises only after great evil has been already wrought.

The agencies which may do such fatal harm to the faith of the young Catholic in the immediate future are manifold. We will

touch only on the more important. In the first rank we would set the infidel atmosphere into which he is often ushered on leaving school; into which he is, at all events, pretty certain to be introduced sooner or later. Non-Catholic society at the present day is impregnated with rationalistic or atheistic principles. The heresy of three hundred years ago has nearly worked itself out to its logical conclusions. The doctrine of free private interpretation of the Bible has already led a multitude of minds to the rejection of the entire Christian creed. Concomitantly with disbelief in the doctrine of the Redemption has grown up a deistic tendency to repudiate a providential government of the world. Finally, an avowed agnosticism, which is practically indistinguishable from positive atheism itself, claims to be the most reasonable as well as the most recent theory of life. An intellectual environment like this must inevitably do grievous injury to any nature that is not specially strengthened against it. The young man in whom Catholic instincts are sound, who starts his worldly career with a strong religious spirit, and who keeps that spirit alive by regular frequentation of the sacraments and the avoidance of sin, may sometimes live unscathed among surroundings most perilous to faith, even though he have little or no knowledge of the rational grounds on which his creed rests. But even to such an one, personally, a training in Catholic philosophy would have been a great benefit; whilst his efficiency as an instrument of good to his neighbour and of glory to God would by means of it have been enormously increased. If, however, from any cause—from the native bent of his mind, from unfortunate early surroundings, or from influences later on in youth—his faith should not be naturally robust, if his devotion should grow cold and his religious duties be neglected, or if the temptations amid which he is placed should succeed in luring him into vice and habits of sin, then, assuredly, there will arise most serious danger to his belief. He begins to conceive a dislike for those portions of Catholic doctrine which utter threats against the evil-doer. His intellect is bribed to find reasons to justify the indulgence of his passions. The complete ignoring of God by the world around him is ever silently suggesting that the unseen universe with which his religion is indissolubly bound up is an illusion; and, as time goes on, unless some extraordinary restorative grace comes, his faith grows gradually fainter, until it is almost impossible to decide that it is not completely extinguished.

Partly the cause, and partly the effect of the noxious intellectual atmosphere which surrounds us, stands out as the next most potent instrument for the disintegration of religious convictions, the poisonous quality of much of the literature of the day. This

new engine of the devil—for it is nothing less—has come upon us so suddenly, and is so skilfully masked that the immense havoc it is capable of effecting is not yet recognised in any adequate manner. It is true that attacks on Christianity, on Providence, or even on the existence of God are by no means novel. During the last three centuries, unfortunately, publications directed against revealed or natural religion have been frequent. But there is a profound difference between the character of infidel literature of the past and present. Hobbes, or Spinoza, or Hume, or La Mettrie, or Holbach, might publish attacks of a grosser or more refined quality on the objects of religious faith. Their works, however, reached but a very limited circle. It is true, indeed, that they are the arsenals from which most of the ammunition of the free-thinkers of the present day is derived. But immediately they could act on the minds of only a comparatively small body of readers—and these mainly men possessed of considerable cultivation, and some power of criticising the arguments presented to them. Now, however, every boy and girl in Europe or America, who can read, is brought within range of the enemy's fire. Each department of literature is pressed into the service of the foe. Large, stout volumes of biblical criticism, neat handbooks on geology or physiology, three-volume novels, professedly infidel magazines, and short spicy articles in popular reviews of a general character, all keep up a constant and increasing cannonade against the foundations on which the faith of the Christian world rests.

The most dangerous of all—at least to the young Catholic—we believe to be in the two last—the popular Review and the Novel. The evil capabilities of the latter, moreover, are largely increased by another modern institution—the lending library. As for the more serious works, every Catholic whose special office does not impose such reading upon him knows that he has no business with books explicitly aimed at the destruction of his faith. He is aware that he is not capable of estimating the value of the arguments which they contain. He sees that they can do him no good, and he feels that they will probably do him much harm. Furthermore, they are not obtruded on his notice; they are not, at all events as yet, prominent on the railway bookstalls and in the lists of the lending library, and they are not subjects of ordinary conversation with which most people moving in good society are expected to be acquainted. The Antichristian novel, and the agnostic article in—say, for example—the *Nineteenth Century* or the *Contemporary Review* are, however, in a different position. By their means the germs of unbelief are now scattered broadcast; and an educated Catholic will hardly pass many years of his life without receiving into his system the

poison, which, unless he is previously strengthened by the appropriate antidote, will inevitably tell.

The monthly Review has now become as much the literary bread of the upper and upper middle classes as was the daily paper thirty years ago. Nine out of the ten articles which each number generally contains are of an innocuous character. Politics, science, literature, art, current events may be the topics : and little harm to the reader is to be anticipated from these. They are all agreeable reading. Each writer has carefully got up the subject which he handles, and he usually presents us in a small space a large quantity of interesting matter. As a consequence, the Review is a successful and profitable institution ; and, so far, we see no reason to blame or condemn it. The remaining article, however, is probably by no means of this harmless quality. It seems to be at present accepted as a fundamental rule by the managers of the leading Reviews that a number is never complete without a paper on the subject of religion, often by such writers as Professor Huxley, or Mr. Herbert Spencer, or Mrs. Ward, or Mr. Leslie Stephen, or some other representative of that line of thought. Now, we have no hesitation in saying that such articles do, in all probability, far more immediate harm than the most elaborate works of the infidels of previous generations. When we consider the enormous circulation of our leading magazines at the present day among the superficially educated classes, it would be scarcely rash to affirm that one of Professor Huxley's Articles may easily do more direct harm to the Christian faith than Spinoza's "Ethic," or Holbach's "System of Nature" could effect in any twenty years of its existence. Here, in a couple of dozen pages, written in a brilliant and effective manner, and interspersed with racy Voltairean sarcasm, the reader finds some great Christian doctrine assailed with the best arguments that physical science and historical or philological research can supply. If his acquaintance with the point treated, and his own intellectual training are such that he can distinctly perceive the fallacy, or the weak links in the writer's argument, the perusal of the article may do but very little harm to his mind ; the discovery of the flaw may even strengthen his own convictions. But if this be not the case—and we fear that as a general rule it is not—if through obscure or superficial ideas regarding the tenet attacked, through ignorance of the justification of the doctrine and of the solution of the difficulty supplied by Catholic philosophy or theology, or through want of that dialectical training which would enable him to discover the flaw in the attempted demonstration ; if from any cause he fails to see his way clearly through the argument, he will certainly receive injury. The damage may be slight or it may be serious ; but at all events some poison has been introduced into

his system, and his constitution necessarily feels the effect. If the process continues, if month after month the dose be repeated, the injury is inevitably increased. The worst feature of this poison is that its action is cumulative. When doubt once takes hold of the intellect resistance becomes feebler and feebler, and every successive difficulty, every successive inroad into the citadel of faith, tends to work more and more havoc.

It is true, of course, that the articles on Religion are not all hostile. Editors find it prudent to preserve an air of impartiality, and so we have also occasional essays in defence of Christian truth. But any thoughtful man who follows a religious controversy in one of the Reviews will come to the conclusion that the evil wrought by the infidel articles is out of all proportion greater than the good effected by those on the side of orthodoxy. It is proverbially easy to urge difficulties; and here the aggressor has the entire field of Catholic Belief to select from. The laws of Magazine controversy do not lay him under obligation to indicate his own views, or to put forward any coherent system. His mission is purely destructive. In his several assaults he may himself adopt the most incompatible positions; and, as a rule, he is not very scrupulous as to his method of attack, provided that he can deal telling blows.

The man who undertakes the defence, on the other hand, is at a great disadvantage. He has to guard a large district of territory. He has to maintain the truth and consistency of a multitude of doctrines—most of them involving mysteries transcending human reason. They all hang together; and very few of them can be adequately defended on their own merits. The strength of the Christian scheme is not in the separate links, but in the entire chain. Consequently, the thorough solution of a single difficulty would sometimes involve a whole treatise on Theology. It is evident, then, that the attempt to reply in sixteen or eighteen pages to a clever assault must often necessarily appear weak and inconclusive, even in the hands of an able writer. Moreover, he cannot, when speaking in behalf of solemn truths, employ that light, flashy cynicism which gives such point and *verve* to the attacks of the enemy.

This recent form of infidel literature is a new source of enormous peril to Catholic youth of the upper classes. There was little danger of his reading a large work written by a professed free-thinker with the declared object of doing harm to the Christian faith. But here the situation is different. Nine-tenths of what the modern Magazine contains he knows to be harmless; some of the articles are constant topics of conversation in society; and he feels awkward if he remains unacquainted with them. He buys



the Review, or reads it at his club; but having taken it up, he is very unlikely to omit the article on Religion.

After the Magazine, probably the next most dangerous enemy is the Lending Library. This new machine showers down books of every sort upon us. Apart altogether from the religious aspect of the question, we are inclined to agree with the late Matthew Arnold, that this recent institution, in spite of its multiplying manifold the reading done by the nation, really causes more harm than good to the true interests of literature. He held that for the average man nearly every book worth reading is worth buying, and that if people had to buy the books which they read, they would, as a rule, only read works of some value. At present, however, the subscribers to a lending library, in order to get what he considers to be the full value for his money, skims through a huge quantity of ephemeral trash, and has no time or taste for reading thoroughly the few good books. Whatever be the force of this argument, the new institution has undoubtedly very much increased the occasions of temptation for the young Catholic in the matter of unwholesome literature. Many a man, for instance, who would not buy or put on his book-shelves such a work as "*Robert Elsmere*," easily yields to the temptation to insert it in his fortnightly list to Mudie or Smith.

We have not space to go at greater length into the rapidly increasing dangers to Faith which already surround the young Catholic, whatever path in life he may elect to follow, but, in addition to these, there are special perils attached to his entrance into the learned professions. The medical student, for instance, will have to receive instruction from a professor who is probably a materialist. Yet the treatment of certain questions entering into his course may be easily made the means of inculcating false and pernicious psychological theories. Thus the physiological and medical works of Drs. Maudsley, Bastian, Luys, and many others, almost invariably contain a large quantity of private dogmatic assertions on philosophical questions as false as they are irrelevant. It is, accordingly, very difficult for the Catholic student who has had no training in philosophy to avoid being injured by the study of these works. Again, the candidate for legal honours at the Bar has to master the writings of Austin, Bentham, and Sir Henry Maine—probably under the guidance of a professor in no way preferable to the author. The relations between Law and Ethics are necessarily very intimate, and these writers in particular give full vent to their views on Morals in their legal works, which the student has to read. It is needless to say that the philosophical doctrines of all three

are radically wrong, and that two of them are distinctly Anti-christian.

We hope we have now made it clear that an educated Catholic, mixing on terms of equality with his neighbours, cannot expect to pass through life in the immediate future without encountering forces which, if he is unprepared for them, may prove ruinous to his faith. The question next arises : How is this grave and threatening evil to be met? What is to be done to prevent these disastrous consequences? For the answer we must come back to the Pope's recent letter, and to the admirable commentary on it contained in that of the Bishop of Salford, published at the same time.

For the young English Catholic of the present day a solid grounding in Philosophy is, His Holiness has told us, a *causa maxima*—a matter of vital moment. There is no conceivable way of guarding him against the coming dangers, save by training him carefully in the principles of that grand system of rational thought which constitutes the basis and the bulwark of the Christian Faith. To us it appears impossible to exaggerate the need of such a training for our young men living in an atmosphere of unbelief. The only method of safe-guarding them against the false is to arm them with the true doctrine, to acquaint them beforehand with the difficulties that are to come, and to instruct them in the solutions that have been wrought out by the greatest intellects of the Catholic Church. If the young Catholic during his closing college years follows a fair course of philosophy, and is judiciously made acquainted with the stock objections to the chief doctrines, he may not, indeed, be secure from all danger afterwards, but he will be in a vastly safer position than if he were flung defenceless into the hostile world that awaits him.

The student who has gone through a course of Catholic Philosophy, in the first place, at any rate knows what doctrine is true on all the more important questions, even if he has not completely mastered the proof in each case. He similarly knows what are the false principles from which the chief modern errors start. Now, even this much knowledge is of immense value. A large part of the harm—perhaps the greater part—caused by Review articles is due to the fact that the reader cannot distinguish the assumptions and assertions which he may grant from those which he should deny. He reads through the essay with a vague feeling that the leading statements seem true, or at all events probable; and then gradually he finds himself carried on to the conclusion which the writer has in view, without being able to detect where the flaw lies. In all probability it was in some of the most unsuspecting looking propositions, the

importance of which the author ingeniously concealed, that the error was introduced; and if the reader only had had a moderate acquaintance with the subject-matter, he would have been able to put his finger on the weak point, and say: "Here the whole question is begged;" or, "This cannot be proved."

Again, a large portion of any systematic course of lectures on Catholic Philosophy is necessarily devoted to the answering of difficulties. The efficient and exhaustive solution of a forcible objection is often the best way of completing the exposition and defence of a doctrine; consequently, from the first days of Christian speculation this has been considered one of the chief functions of the professor. The result is, that the student, by the time he has completed his course, is familiar with the solution of almost every possible objection that can be suggested to him during his after-life. We have ourselves made an estimate of the number of objections thus handled during a course of about five months' lectures on "Natural Theology." We found that in all about one hundred and fifty had been dealt with. As the stock objections of the Magazine essayists and popular lecturers do not exceed a score, the young Catholic who has done such a course, even in a moderately careful way, ought to be pretty well provided for the enemy.

This matter introduces us to an objection urged occasionally by Catholics of experience against the wisdom of introducing all young men indiscriminately into a branch of study which may, even in the hands of the most judicious professor, be attended with danger to some minds. Is it not possible, it is urged, that you may raise doubts which you cannot allay? Is it not likely that your exposition of particular difficulties may be more intelligible to some of your hearers than the corresponding solutions? Is there not a danger that you may arouse in certain intellects an interest in philosophical controversies which may lead them into dangers from which they would otherwise be exempt? We do not for a moment wish to consider this a trifling argument; it undoubtedly possesses weight; and it proves that great prudence is required of the professor entrusted with the delivery of a course of Philosophy to young Catholic laymen. Serious harm may indisputably be done to individual minds if judgment and caution are not exercised in the treatment of many subjects; and before now the germs of unbelief have unfortunately been imported into the system by the very medicine which was intended to strengthen the constitution against the disease.

But the study of Catholic Philosophy is not exceptional in this respect. Every good gift is liable to abuse; and even the sacraments themselves may be perverted to the deeper ruin of the sinner. Moreover, with reasonable care, the chances of harm

ought to be reduced to very small dimensions. The surroundings of the student during the period of his philosophical course are all most favourable. The atmosphere of his college is not only Catholic but distinctly religious. The moral tone which prevails around him is very much superior to that of the world into which he will have to enter. He has received a good Catholic training, and his natural disposition, apart from his knowledge of the obligations of his Faith, is to accept and defend the doctrine approved by the Church. He is, moreover, surrounded by companions governed by the same spirit. And, more important still, he has at hand his professor, familiar with his character, to whom he can easily go for particular assistance in special difficulties, and for general guidance in his reading. Finally, whether the young Catholic receives a course in Philosophy or not, he cannot, henceforward, avoid coming across assaults on his faith. He cannot hope to go through life without meeting the enemy. The only question now is, whether he should meet him prepared or unprepared—whether he should, whilst all the surrounding influences are favourable, have exposed to him, and answered for him, by a prudent and competent teacher, the objections which he is certain to meet afterwards, or whether he should wait to have them thrust upon him when his own faith and devotion may have grown cold, and when all the surroundings are adverse. Whatever method may have been wisest for our fathers or grandfathers, there seems to us to be absolutely no doubt as to the course that we ought to take at the present day. The boy who may manage to receive injury from a carefully delivered course of Catholic Philosophy, the boy who seems always to apprehend the difficulty, but rarely the answer, who appears to have a natural affinity for erroneous doctrines, and who has a strong preference for reading the wrong books—the boy or man of this type is just the one who is sure to meet the full force of the infidel agencies in after-life. He would be certain to come across the difficulties and objections later on, when their power of injuring him would be far greater. Clearly, then, even in his case a course of philosophy will be a great benefit.

It is therefore a matter of the greatest consequence that Catholic parents who seek to secure their children the advantages of higher education should realise the enormous importance of a philosophical training. There is danger lest that, since they themselves have not felt the need of it, they may not see how essential it be to the safety of their children's faith in the immediate future. There is also a danger lest, since Catholic philosophy does not count in Competitive Examinations, and is not included amongst the subjects required by the Bar or

Medical corporations, that worldly-minded people ignore its value. However, any man of experience in the learned professions will bear witness that, even from a purely utilitarian point of view, a philosophical training is an excellent investment. For our own part, we can imagine no better educational training for the future barrister than that to be derived from a good course of Catholic Philosophy. The careful study of Logic and Ethics is as direct and immediate a preparation for his later work as, for instance, that of Roman Law, whilst the dialectical training afforded by the mastering of the proofs of the theses, and the solution of the objections in Natural Theology and the other branches of metaphysics, cannot be surpassed. In Medicine, too, we believe that an elementary knowledge of Psychology is now required by most bodies which have the power of conferring degrees. But, whether prescribed or not, there can be little doubt that the doctor who has made a careful study of the science of the mind has a distinct advantage over a rival who has never done so. The advantages of such a philosophical training for the man destined for a literary career, or who intends to take part in public life, are too obvious to require dwelling upon.

But the primary motive for the Catholic parent must be, not the worldly advantage to be derived from a course of sound philosophy, but the absolute necessity of this element in a complete religious education. If the educated Catholic intends henceforward to take part in the higher social life of this country, he must either put his faith in serious jeopardy, or have previously received a sound discipline in the principles which underlie his belief. The whole situation is so admirably stated in the letter of the Bishop of Salford to which we have already alluded, that we do not hesitate to quote his Lordship's words at length :

Catholic youth in England is probably in greater danger of imbibing false principles from society and the literature of the day—in greater need, therefore, of safeguards and tests of truth—than the Catholic youth of countries in which either the line of demarcation between wholesome and poisonous literature is clearer, or Catholic society is more preponderant in influence and stronger than it is in England. Catholics in England have one of two courses to choose—either rigidly to stand outside the intellectual movement of the day, remaining resolutely strangers to it, or diligently to fortify their minds by the study of Catholic Philosophy, so as at once skilfully to spot and expose the false principles which pass current with the mass of men as signs of progress and superior wisdom. I fully appreciate the position of a Catholic who professes openly to be unable, from want of training, to deal with the intellectual difficulties of the day, and takes the Catechism with the

*maxim sentire cum ecclesia*, as his sole guide and defence. This is the only position tenable for a Catholic untrained in Catholic Philosophy. He cannot attempt to enter the lists against intellectual error and sophistry, without extreme imprudence and peril to the perfection and stability of his faith. An unarmed civilian is no match against an armed band of invaders. On the other hand, who does not see that Catholics mixing on an equality with the English educated classes—whose whole literature, whose minds and opinions are impregnated and permeated with rationalistic principles or materialism—ought to be equipped with the solid armour and weapons of Catholic Philosophy? I can hardly conceive a serious and thoughtful Catholic parent deliberately supposing that he can give his son a liberal education—an education fitting him to deal with educated men upon their own level, without securing for him a competent training in Catholic Philosophy. Catholics who are to be launched upon the storm and wreck of intellectual opinions which cover the modern society of England, ought at least to be prepared beforehand for the dangers they will encounter. They ought to be trained in the use of the one approved lifeboat which can weather the storm. Instead of that we behold many parents, with a simplicity equalled only by its folly, taking no heed to such precautions, trusting that their son may somehow or other escape at last with his life, and finally save his soul. One or two years devoted to the solid course of philosophical studies now established at Stonyhurst would go far to prepare a man to meet the philosophical dangers to which he will be exposed, and to give him a superiority over the English University students with whom he may be brought into contact in early life. It is not surprising, therefore, that the Holy Father should promptly avail himself of an opportunity to give a solemn expression of praise to the efforts which have been made to establish good courses of Philosophy in the vernacular for our Catholic laity, and that he should conclude his letter by urging that the study of Catholic Philosophy should be widely extended among the Catholics of England.

Assuming now that the Catholic parent has been led to see the vital need of a training in Catholic Philosophy for his child, the next question to arise is: "How is the demand for this article to be supplied?" The answer here is, fortunately, ready enough—by an extension of the work already begun, and which has just received the special approval of His Holiness. A course of Catholic Philosophy should be within the reach of all those who receive the advantage of an education at our Catholic Colleges; it is as essential, nay, as we have shown, more essential than any other part of the training which our boys receive, consequently it must be brought within the power of all. The problem, therefore, is: How is this to be effected? The Holy Father expresses the desire that as in Stonyhurst and Ushaw, "so also in the other Catholic colleges, attention should be given to the



advancement of sound and solid philosophical teaching." We do not, however, think that this observation is to be interpreted as implying that His Holiness wants a complete philosophical course to be instituted in every Catholic school in the country. Such a project would, it seems to us, be impracticable. Of the fourteen or fifteen best-known Catholic schools several do not take their boys higher than Humanities; and of the entire list very few indeed retain an average of even six or seven students to the end of Rhetoric. Now, clearly, for a college of some eighty or one hundred boys, of whom not more than six or seven survive Humanities, and three or four, perhaps, reach Rhetoric, it would involve annually a serious loss without any corresponding good to secure a capable professor of philosophy, and devote him to this work. In all probability he will not have more than two or three students, unless the lower classes, who are utterly unfit as yet for this subject, are admitted.

If a course of Catholic Philosophy is to be given at all, it must, at the present day, be well done. The man devoted to the office must know his business, and his heart must be in his work. His lectures ought to be carefully prepared, and he must have time for this. He must also have a sufficient motive to enable him to give his full energy to this important duty. Now, if he feels that he have an audience of which not more than two or three are capable of following the matter, it will be virtually impossible for him to throw himself into his subject as he ought, if it is to be satisfactorily handled. Again, from the student's point of view, there is no branch of his educational course in which he derives so much benefit from the presence of a large number of school-fellows as that of philosophy. The life of philosophy is *discussion*. If interest is to be aroused and sustained, if wits are to be sharpened, if difficulties are to be satisfactorily threshed out, and proofs thoroughly comprehended, if, in fact, the study of Catholic Philosophy of to-day is to be a reflection, however faint, of that which prevailed in the glorious period when scholasticism was at its zenith, then, assuredly, there must be a tolerable number of students to make a philosophical class worthy of its name. In our own opinion, a class which does not on the average contain at least a dozen members will not have sufficient vitality to maintain an efficient course of Philosophy. If there be twenty in the school the value of the course will be more than doubled, if thirty it will be still further increased.

It is possible even, in a very small school, and the practice has prevailed, we believe, at several of our colleges, to assign the philosophical tuition of the one or two boys who desire to have it to some worthy old priest incapacitated by increasing age and infirmity from taking part in the general educational work

of the establishment, and who, some thirty or forty years ago, may have imbibed enough philosophical information from the text-books then current to enable him to enter upon his theological studies. Now, the need of philosophical instruction of some sort is become so acute that even the notions a student may be able to pick up by this means may possibly be better than complete ignorance; still, there could be no greater mistake than to suppose that this is a course of Philosophy, or that any student, however diligent, can derive from this species of tuition the substantial advantages of systematic teaching. It certainly is not the method recommended by the Pope to the Catholic colleges.

Since, then, it is impossible to start and sustain courses of Philosophy in each college, evidently the best plan is to have a small number of recognised and well-supported centres, at which such courses will be delivered, and which will severally represent in their general character the various grades to which the other colleges belong. It is evidently incomparably better that there should be two or three well-known centres, such as Ushaw and Stonyhurst, where efficient courses could be given, and large classes of philosophers gathered together, than that each school should have one or two students nominally following such a course. It would in no way interfere with the interests of the smaller establishments that the boys who had passed through their classes should afterwards pass to a common centre to complete their philosophical course; and the final year or two amid new companions from other schools would have a widening and invigorating effect of a most beneficial character on the minds of the boys themselves.

It may now be asked, What should be the general character of the course of Philosophy to be thus arranged for young Catholic laymen? In the first place, it seems to us clear that the course ought to be in English. In saying this, we do not at all mean to ignore the necessity of Latin lectures for the ecclesiastical student destined to go on to theology, and their inestimable value for the man who intends to continue his studies until he acquires a thorough mastery of the scholastic philosophy. We have in view merely the average English Catholic layman about to enter the world; and we have no hesitation in asserting that to be of any immediate practical advantage to him it must be in vernacular. The two courses selected by the Pope for approval—that given by Mr. Wilfrid Ward, at Ushaw, and that given at Stonyhurst—are both in English. His Holiness, also in the same letter, expresses his satisfaction at the publication of the Stonyhurst series of philosophical text-works in English, so we clearly have the Pope's sanction in this matter.

In the second place, the course of Philosophy intended for the

Catholic layman should embrace all the leading questions of our own time. It will, indeed, have to contain a satisfactory exposition of positive doctrine, and all the chief theses in each branch will have to be established. But, besides this, most of the Latin manuals include a very large quantity of matter not likely to be of much use to the lay student, whilst, unfortunately, they are, as a rule, very jejune and deficient in their handling of the difficulties of the present hour. The errors of the Neo-Platonists, of Averrhoes, or of Abelard, may, indeed, present matter for intellectual exercise, but this is equally furnished by the great heresies of to-day. We are inclined even to think that the labour devoted by the Latin text-books to the demolition of Locke, or Reid, and the Scotch school, is thrown away. The works of these writers do little harm just now, yet the majority of the scholastic manuals stop at these authors. The errors which cry out for refutation are not those of the thirteenth, or even the eighteenth century, but those of the last fifty years.

It is true, indeed, that the most recent false doctrines often have their source in a writer dead some generations ago—and it will be the duty of the professor to trace them up to their fountain-head; but if his work is to be of practical use to his disciples, he must refute error in its most modern shape. At the same time, it will not be wise to attempt to crowd the memory of the student with refutations of the innumerable systems of heterodox teachers who have appeared in recent times. Such a plan would merely confuse the learner's mind, or at best afford him a superficial smattering of information regarding theories which he had not really grasped. The right method is to select the two or three typical lines of false thought which virtually hold the field at present. The two leading antagonistic schools founded by Hume and Kant include, we believe, between them nine-tenths of the errors of our day. For the English Catholic student a thorough treatment of the Philosophy of the empirical school from its first exposition by the celebrated Scotch sceptic down to its latest developments in the hands of Bain and Herbert Spencer, is of the first importance. It is the philosophy which has held despotic sway in this country for the last fifty years, and which is only now beginning to be seriously challenged. Kant until recently had very little influence in this country; but during the last thirty years the German Idealism of the first quarter of the nineteenth century has been showing increasing symptoms of revival here at home. The critical philosophy, or rather a development of Kant's teaching in the direction of Hegelianism, has already routed the old English sensationalism at several of the Universities, and the Catholic student of the future has to be prepared for Scylla just as well as for Charybdis.

Materialism is so distinctively the heresy of our popular scientists that too much pains cannot be devoted to its complete confutation, both in Natural Theology and Psychology. In the former branch, the bearing of the doctrine of natural selection on the Design Argument requires efficient handling; and agnosticism must be adequately treated. In Ethics, a great deal of work—and of indifferent or bad work—has been done in recent years by English writers, which the Catholic professor cannot ignore. In the first place, the foundations of morality must be solidly laid and well defended. It is not enough to expound to the student the magnificent doctrine of St. Thomas on the “Eternal Law” and the “Natural Law.” He must be carefully armed against the acute and plausible difficulties of Sidgwick, of Leslie Stephen, and of Herbert Spencer, no less than against those already ancient worthies, Mill and Bain. Moral writers of such wide influence as Green and Martineau should also not be passed over in silence. In “Applied Ethics” Catholic text-books have, as a rule, been better than in the abstract portion of the same science; but the social questions of the hour present a long list of new problems urgently demanding treatment from the standpoint of Catholic Philosophy.

We have now spoken of the necessity of courses of Philosophy for the youths at our Colleges, of the way in which it seems to us the arrangement of such courses could be best effected for the good of the general Catholic body, and of the character which the instruction should assume. It may be worth while to make one or two observations or suggestions that have been put forward for the extension of the knowledge of Philosophy amongst Catholics not at our Colleges. The Pope’s recent letter, which is the text of our present article, does not allude to this subject; still, a word or two may not be thrown away. It has been proposed that courses of lectures covering the several branches of Philosophy should be given in our leading towns, so as to furnish a general notion of Catholic teaching to those desirous of knowing at least something of the subject. The extraordinary success which has attended the University extension lectures in this country lends a good deal of plausibility to the idea. But it is doubtful whether educated Catholics are yet sufficiently strong and sufficiently impressed with the value of a philosophical course to make this project a success. The plan has, we believe, been tried in Liverpool. In spite, however, of some advantages, that city is not well selected for a first venture. Though the number of Catholics there is very large, the proportion of them who belong to the middle or upper classes is infinitesimal. It is not improbable that a similar course if given in London would command a much larger degree of

success. In popular lectures of this sort, moreover, it would probably be advisable to limit the course to the more easy and interesting subjects such as Ethics, Natural Theology, and the simpler questions of Psychology. It will be very difficult to make abstruse metaphysical problems intelligible to a mixed audience.

It should, too, not be lost sight of that some of the objections based upon the danger of raising doubts that are not easily allayed, which we have before treated of, may have real force here. The lecturer will certainly require a thorough knowledge of his matter as well as great prudence; and if he offers to answer all difficulties, he may easily find himself drawn into an unprofitable controversy. At the same time, now that we have got in the "Stonyhurst Series" a complete course of Philosophy in the vernacular, a few lectures on each branch would probably give the diligent student enough start to enable him to read up the whole subject for himself.

The possibility of the private student initiating himself into Catholic Philosophy has called forth the suggestion of the institution of reading-parties as an alternative or a supplement to the project of courses of popular lectures. This method of study has been adopted with considerable success, we believe, in many towns in connection with the University Extension scheme. And if a number of young men anxious to improve themselves, and very desirous of getting a sound knowledge of Catholic Philosophy, meet together frequently for mutual help and the interchange of ideas, and if they are provided with a competent guide to direct their reading and to assist in the solution of difficulties, they would undoubtedly derive much good from the practice. But we fear that the earnestness and thirst for knowledge required to make this method a success are yet far too rare.

The main hope then for the young Catholic of the future lies in the institution of courses of Philosophy which will be within the reach of all who are taught at our colleges. Such a course must come to be looked on as an integral part of his education—as not less essential than the instruction in Latin and Greek, of which he will probably never make any use after he has left school. But, in order that this be brought about, in order that philosophical courses be instituted, and that Philosophy be made an essential part of the Catholic student's course, it is necessary that parents be got to realise its importance. With them the matter ultimately lies. The demand will create the supply. If they see the need, and if they really desire philosophical tuition for their sons, the colleges will be certain to take measures to meet the want.

ART. IV.—TALLEYRAND'S DIPLOMATIC LETTERS,  
1792-1799.

1. *La Mission de Talleyrand à Londres en 1792 ; ses lettres d'Amérique à Lord Lansdowne.* Avec Introduction et Notes, par G. PALLAIN. Paris: E. Plon, Nourrit et Cie. 1889.
2. *Le Ministère de Talleyrand sous le Directoire.* Avec Introduction et Notes par G. PALLAIN. Paris: E. Plon, Nourrit et Cie. 1891.

"THE true life of a man is in his letters. . . . Not only for the interest of a biography, but for arriving at the inside of things, the publication of letters is the true method."\*

This principle applies especially to Talleyrand. His long-looked-for Memoirs have at last appeared. The general impression produced by them is that the great diplomat, not satisfied with overreaching his contemporaries during his long life, has endeavoured to overreach posterity also. By delaying the publication of his manuscript until at least thirty years after his death,† he thought to secure his statements from contradiction. But, happily for the cause of historic truth, there still exist in public archives and private cabinets many thousands of his letters. In these his true life is to be sought. The Memoirs, indeed, will always be read with interest; but they will need to be checked or confirmed by what Talleyrand himself wrote at the time when the events occurred. M. Pallain has done well to work this literary mine. He has already brought to light four volumes of letters. Besides the two mentioned at the head of this article, he has also published "*Correspondance inédite du prince de Talleyrand et du roi Louis XVIII. pendant le congrès de Vienne*," and "*Ambassade de Talleyrand à Londres, 1830-1834 : première partie.*" All four volumes are enriched with valuable introductions and notes; but, unfortunately, three of them, like so many French books, have no index. I propose here to give some account of the contents of the volumes which deal with Talleyrand's early diplomatic career. On some future occasion I

---

\* Dr. Newman to his sister, Mrs. Mozley, May, 1863. Long ago St. Gregory Nazianzen had said that St. Paul should be studied in his letters. *Τὸ Παῦλος αὐτὸς περὶ Παύλου φησὶν ἀκούσωμεν (Orat. Apolog.).*

† Talleyrand died in 1838. His Memoirs should therefore have appeared in 1868. But his literary executors have thought fit to keep them back until the present year, more than half a century after his death.



hope to treat of his relations with Napoleon, and his services during the Restoration. It may be as well to state at the outset that I have no intention of attacking or defending his conduct; still, I venture to think that any one who studies his letters will come to the conclusion that he was not so black as he is painted. His name has supplanted that of Macchiavelli as a byword for cynical deception. But we who live in an age that has worshipped the shallow cunning of Napoleon III., and the brutal, bullying methods of Palmerston and Bismarck, may sometimes look back with regret on the skilled and polished diplomacy of Talleyrand, Bishop of Autun and Prince of Benevento.

One of the characteristics of the "philosophes" of the eighteenth century was an unbounded admiration for all that was English. Voltaire's "*Lettres Anglaises*" and Montesquieu's panegyric of the English Constitution set the fashion. Later on, the economists taught the advantages of a free interchange of goods between the two countries, and deplored the fearful waste of wealth which had been entailed by their long wars. Hence a strong party, led by Mirabeau in the Assembly, took the English Constitution as their model, and strenuously advocated an offensive and defensive alliance with England. Pitt, the English Minister, was not averse to the proposal. He was above all things an economist. In his early days, at least, he had none of the military ardour of his father, the great commoner. Besides, it could not but be flattering to the mass of Englishmen that their ancient foe at length sought an alliance with them, and acknowledged the superiority of everything English. But there was a greater than Pitt here in England who looked with no friendly eye upon the changes that were being made by the Assembly, and whose prophetic vision foresaw the terrible scenes that were yet to come. Just at the moment when the prospects of an alliance were at their brightest, Edmund Burke startled Europe by his "*Reflections on the French Revolution*." The vials of his wrath were poured out on all who found anything in common between the demagogues of the Assembly and the statesmen who had brought about the "*glorious Revolution*" of 1688. The new Constitution, both civil and ecclesiastical, was assailed with the bitterest ridicule. But, above all, the violence of the mob, the pillages, the murders, the insults to the king and his august spouse, were described in words that stirred men's deepest indignation. A great reaction set in. Men felt that the spirit of the Revolution must be stamped out. Pitt tried for a time to resist, but he too was afterwards carried away. The Whig party, already thinned by the evil consequences of the coalition, was now reduced to a mere handful. Mirabeau, the chief support of the English connection, died in April 1791. All hope of an

alliance seemed now at an end. But Mirabeau's diplomatic confidence still survived. Talleyrand persuaded the new Assembly to persevere. He himself undertook to win over the Cabinet of St. James's, and accordingly set out for London in January 1792.

As early as 1786 Mirabeau, at that time about to start on a secret mission to Berlin, sent by the hands of Talleyrand a memoir to M. de Vergennes, the Minister of Foreign Affairs. In it he said: "France has inexhaustible resources, but she must be better advised and better served. We must try to make friends with England." And again, writing from Berlin to the Abbé de Périgord, as Talleyrand was then styled: "The idea [of an alliance with England] has been revolving in my head for the last seven years; . . . it would change the face of Europe, and would be altogether to our benefit, because it would only make the English our carriers." And on his death-bed Mirabeau bequeathed to Talleyrand the execution of this favourite project. The Assembly could therefore have made no better choice. But there was an obstacle in the way. Robespierre had induced the former Assembly to pass the fatal self-denying ordinance forbidding the employment of any of its members by the State. How could Talleyrand, who had held so prominent a position in that body, be now sent on a diplomatic mission? An attempt was made to evade the difficulty by furnishing him with the following letter of introduction from the French Foreign Minister to Lord Grenville, the English Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs. It is evidently from the pen of Talleyrand himself:

This letter will be delivered to your Excellency by M. de Talleyrand-Périgord, formerly Bishop of Autun, who is going to England for various reasons which interest him personally. I have no doubt that he is already known to you by his reputation for wit, by his distinguished talents, as well as by the important part which he played in our Constituent Assembly. I shall be personally obliged for the welcome that your Excellency will be good enough to give him: you will certainly deem him worthy of it for his own qualities.

M. de Talleyrand, having been a member of the Constituent Assembly, is incapable of bearing any diplomatic character. But as he has been in a position to study our political relations, above all those which we have with England, I beg your Excellency to discuss them with him, and I am certain beforehand that he will convince you of our desire to maintain and strengthen the good understanding which exists between the two kingdoms.

Talleyrand arrived in London on Tuesday, January 24, 1792, and took up his abode at No. 33 Golden Square. He was not able to see Pitt until the 30th. He thus describes their meeting:

Our interview, as I had foreseen, consisted of nothing but mere civilities. On reading your letter he remarked that I had no character. I answered that I could not have any. He at once added that all the same he should be very glad to talk about French affairs. He remembered that we had once met at Rheims. . . . My plan is to see him often, but more by chance than by appointment. I think it is better not to show any eagerness; this is the best way of exciting it in others; it is at least a sign that we are not in need of any reply, and it places us in the best position for attaining our object as soon as you shall have drawn up your political plan of campaign. I am still of opinion that England is your best field. Just now, indeed, it is our only firm ground. As we have to deal here with men of method, we must proceed in an orderly fashion. First and foremost, we must strive to secure a declaration of neutrality at the present moment. We must show in every possible way that England need not look upon herself as bound by any of her treaties to help our enemies. . . . I am not sure, but I am strongly of opinion, that it will be a good, nay a great, thing to obtain a positive declaration to this effect. A formal refusal to recognise the duty of furnishing supplies to those who have reckoned on them would necessarily be a step in our direction, and, by that very fact, an opening for an alliance. (Talleyrand to Delessart, January 31, 1792).

A few days afterwards (February 3) he goes on to speak about the way to persuade England to declare her neutrality:

We must show by a bold countenance that we have the right to ask for it, and that it is England's interest to grant it. Every one must be addressed in his own language. We speak to the Northern Powers, with 150,000 men at our backs; it is with a fleet that we must speak to England. Nations do not make up their minds unless you excite them as to their own interests; and when their power is based upon credit, which the slightest event or even a shadow disturbs, this method cannot fail to succeed. England, therefore, which certainly seems more tranquil than she really is, should see in us neighbours with whom she must come to terms; she should know that we can do her more harm or more good than Prussia can, for Prussia cannot secure for her India or America; she should bear in mind that our new Constitution, whether she approve of it or not, is the strongest guarantee of her own, and that two neighbouring nations, one of which relies on commerce, and the other on agriculture, are destined by the nature of things to be on good terms with each other, &c. &c. Some evil genius, I think, is mixed up in our affairs. Every imaginable means have been taken to give a false notion of our position. We are said to have no will or power to do anything—no plan, no men, no army, no navy. Let us change our conduct and our language, and I warrant that England will listen to us. But if we do not consider ourselves worthy to treat with her, if we think that we are beaten beforehand, if we do

not believe in our own Revolution, how can we inspire any confidence in others? It is, then, on our attitude that I insist. A squadron at Brest would certainly produce a good effect. . . . Moreover, it is essential that you should send here an envoy with full powers, and in sympathy with the Revolution.

I was presented to the King yesterday—civilities and the ordinary questions.\*

The task before Talleyrand was no easy one. His project met with little encouragement from his own Government. Delessart seldom answered his letters, and even when he did so it was to raise objections. The state of Paris grew more and more alarming; the danger of the king and queen aroused the sympathies of the other Sovereigns. The French Chargé d'Affaires in London wrote to say that it had practically been decided that England would join the league against France. But Talleyrand did not despair. On Feb. 15, that is, a little more than a fortnight after his arrival, he had a long interview with Lord Grenville. They had previously met on several occasions, but the quondam bishop had avoided any serious conversation, because, as he says, he wanted first to see how he stood and to measure his man. He describes what took place in a letter to Delessart (Feb. 17). The following extract is long, but it will serve to give the reader an excellent idea of Talleyrand's diplomatic method. Put a pen into his hand, let him button-hole a Minister in his cabinet, and the face of Europe becomes changed :

For a long time past, said I to Lord Grenville, every man of sound judgment in France has been desiring a rapprochement with England: it seems reasonable, natural, and advantageous to both Powers. Our Government has wished me to come here. . . . It knows that I am entirely devoted to the cause of liberty and equality, and to the establishment of our monarchical Constitution, while, at the same time, I have opposed the disorders which have disfigured so fair a cause; it knows that I have always maintained that England was our natural ally. . . . I cannot be the bearer of any diplomatic character to your Court, because this would be contrary

---

\* "The King of England, who is not given to favour the French Revolution, received M. de Talleyrand very coldly. The Queen was even more distant with him, as she did not say a single word to him. The Ministers paid him more regard, but we shall soon know whether they have given him any confidence." (*Gazette Universelle*, February 19, 1792). Forty years later Talleyrand met with a very different reception. Cannon announced his arrival; the son of the Victor of Waterloo, at that time Prime Minister, came to offer him a guard of honour; the great city magnates at once called on him; the King (William IV.) received him most cordially. His reception by the Queen was even more gratifying. She asked how things were going on in France. "Madam," replied the old beau, "our King is loved, and when one is loved everything becomes easy, as no one knows better than your Majesty, and your august spouse."

to our Constitution ; but I can lay before you the desire of my countrymen, and support them with arguments drawn from reason, justice, and fitness.

Above all, I must explain to you the present state of France. You are continually being told that all is anarchy there. This is, to say the least, an exaggeration. We have, of course, our troubles ; but I need not explain to a well-read Englishman that a revolution so extraordinary and so rapid as ours must leave some germs of agitation. . . . Nevertheless, we have a Constitution accepted by the king, and sworn to by the whole of France ; we have local administrations, judges, juries, a vast armed force, an inexhaustible soil completely freed from burdens ; and, lastly, we have methods provided by the Constitution for bringing about any reforms that may be needed. All this, I grant, is not yet in full working order, for inexperience, distrust, and bad faith are obstacles to many movements. . . . If I were speaking to a Minister of M. de Maurepas' age [he was seventy-three years old at the time of his second Ministry], and in a country less enlightened than England, I should perhaps feel some embarrassment, because one who has but a short time to live might think only of the benefits which England would derive from our present troubles ; but you, my lord, are only thirty ; you will still be young when many years shall have gone by, and, whether you are Minister or not, you will enjoy the glory of having secured for your country a real and lasting happiness . . . The French Revolution is a fact ; you may oppose it, you may fight against it, but it has excited too many heads, it has aroused too many sentiments, to be ever stamped out. *There*, added I, is a vast field for meditation to all Governments ; *there* is something to tempt a Minister worthy of our epoch, who has seen all the rights, the powers, the pretensions, and the prejudices of this earth handed over to the tribunal of reason. The Powers of the north must perceive that it is useless to fight against the Revolution ; but the English should deem such opposition a crime, for they themselves are free because it is their own will.

He then renounced all ideas of propagandism, and spoke in terms of the highest praise concerning the English Constitution ; Frenchmen would ever look upon the English as their elder brothers in freedom, and their models of courage in its defence. Nor were hints concerning the weak points of English policy omitted—India, which was in a state of war ; Ireland, where troubles were breaking out. “You know better than I,” said he to Lord Grenville, “that peace is the soul of your commerce and of your credit, and that credit is the soul of your power.”

This is very much [he concluded] what I said to Lord Grenville. I thought it over too carefully to forget it. I spoke to him for about three-quarters of an hour. He listened with the greatest attention, and often repeated my words. I begged him more than once not to interrupt me, and not to reply at the time, for I did not wish, as I

told him, to take him by surprise, or to receive any vague answers. I wanted him to understand me exactly, and then to reflect at his leisure. In order that none of my remarks should be forgotten, I gave him a summary of them before leaving him. I begged him not to lose sight of what I had said about the object of my visit to England, about the state of France at the present time, and about what she might one day become; about the connections between England and France, some of them natural, others brought about by the Revolution itself; about our desires at the present time, and the reasons why the English Government should fall in with them. He told me that he thoroughly understood me, and bore in mind what I had said. I once more begged him to make no reply, and then we parted.\*

On March 1 Grenville sent for Talleyrand, and informed him that he had laid before the Cabinet the substance of their last interview, but that it had been decided to make no reply. Pitt, Dundas, and Grenville himself were in favour of France, but Camden, Thurlow, and, above all, the King, were altogether on the other side. Talleyrand was somewhat disappointed. He rightly attributed part of the failure to the fact of his having no definite recognised position. However, he assured Delessart that it was clear from Grenville's manner that although England would not make any formal declaration of neutrality, she would in fact remain neutral.

It is interesting to turn to Grenville's account of these meetings. Writing to Lord Gower, the English Ambassador in Paris, he says:

I have had the honour of twice seeing M. Talleyrand on the subject of his mission to this country. The first time that I met him he spoke in very general terms about the disposition of the French Government to enter into the closest relations with England, and he proposed a treaty of mutual guarantee, or any other means which the Government of this country might prefer. Having said this, he at once begged me not to make any immediate reply, and gave me to understand that he would prefer to see me again on the subject. I answered, that to oblige him I would do so, but at the same time I took care to warn him that in all probability I should confine myself to expressing how impossible it was to discuss such delicate subjects with one who had no authority to treat. When I saw him the second time I repeated this, and added that it was the only answer that it was lawful for me to give him; but that nevertheless I took it on myself to tell him personally (as indeed I had often

---

\* Long afterwards, in 1833, Talleyrand used the same arguments in his interviews with Palmerston and Grey. "The two Ministers," he wrote, "listened attentively to the remarks which I developed to them, and seemed to be impressed by what I said."



told any Frenchmen whom I had spoken to on the present state of France), that our Government did not seek to excite or to prolong the disturbances for the sake of benefiting by them.

Delessart was now much struck by Talleyrand's labours. He felt, however, that it would be better for them to meet in order to discuss matters at length. Accordingly the envoy returned to Paris on March 10. But meantime great events were taking place. The Emperor Leopold died on March 1. Delassart himself was charged with high treason, and the Cabinet of Moderates, to which he belonged, was broken up. Louis, whose real object was to tide over the next few months till the arrival of the Austrians and Prussians in Paris, now chose members of the Left as his Ministers. They at once declared war against the allies. The friendly negotiations with England were, however, renewed. Dumouriez, the new Foreign Minister, was intimate with Talleyrand. It was arranged between them that a young friend named Chauvelin should be sent as plenipotentiary to London, but that he was to be only a figure-head to Talleyrand, who was to be the real ambassador. Talleyrand had proposed that Louis XVI. should write to George III. to assure him of the goodwill of the French Government towards England, and so to endeavour to win over the English king. Louis now wrote, or rather was made to write, a private letter, in which he expressed his ardent desire to see the two countries joined in friendly alliance, and spoke of Talleyrand in such terms as to give him a quasi-official character. The wily diplomat took care also to draw up written instructions for himself and his nominal chief. In them we find that "his majesty desires his Minister to act in concert with [Talleyrand and Duroveray], and consequently the instructions are directed to all three of them collectively." Chauvelin reached London April 24; his colleagues followed a few days later.

The news of the outbreak of the war had caused great excitement in England. The Funds fell 4 per cent. Pitt, indeed, still strove hard for peace. He sent round to the press a notification that there was "not the smallest sign of anything that could destroy the existing peace, which every one was so anxious to maintain." The three envoys, however, were received with coldness. George III., knowing well that the so-called royal letter did not contain Louis' real opinions, sent only a curt reply. But once more Talleyrand triumphed over all obstacles. A formal declaration of neutrality appeared in the *London Gazette* of May 26.

The war opened badly for the Revolutionists: the troops fled in disorder in the first battle. Paris was thrown into confusion at this failure; the new Ministry was dismissed early in June;

Dumouriez, disgusted with the excesses of his colleagues, attempted to take the king's side, but was compelled by the Assembly to resign (June 15). Five days afterwards Louis and his queen were mobbed in the Tuileries. Talleyrand was summoned back from London, but proved to be of little aid; he never possessed any power of controlling masses of men. On August 10, the monarchy fell. The hastily formed Provisional Government was most anxious not to provoke England to war, and now Talleyrand rendered the greatest service. His apology for the overthrow of the monarchy is a masterpiece. Unfortunately, it is too long to be quoted here in full, but the following abridged extracts will be read with interest:

The Provisional Executive Council of France, to which the most imperious necessity, viz., that of the public welfare, has just given birth, amidst the terrible scenes of August 10, believes that it owes to all the Powers—and particularly to those which, like England, have kept themselves within the bounds of neutrality—an account of the events which have just taken place, of the weighty reasons which have given rise to them, and of the unchangeable sentiments which animate the French nation.

For a long time the public confidence, that first need of kings, was withdrawing from Louis XVI. The French people saw, at first with sorrow, but at length with indignation, that the new Constitution in which the King occupied so fair a post, was insensibly being undermined by him: that the King, still the slave of the prejudices of his education, could not bring himself to look upon the august function which was delegated to him as an honourable endowment, but that he found in it only the degrading remnant of a power unjustly torn from him; that bribes were lavished by him for the purpose of extinguishing the burning patriotism with which he was beset; that he surrounded himself with the enemies of freedom and held aloof from its friends; that all the remonstrances addressed to him only embittered him the more; that the war declared against the Emperor in support of our revolution was not, and never could be, maintained in good faith by one who looked upon himself as robbed by it—nay, rather, that the war, if conducted by him, could not fail to end disastrously for France.

When at length these suspicions became confirmed; when the Tuileries was filled with armed men resolved on a counter-revolution; when it was known that a great number of Swiss, who had remained in Paris in spite of a formal decree of the National Assembly, had been won over in the most criminal fashion; when every rumour and every sign pointed to a vast plot ready to burst out everywhere in France—then it was that the people of Paris, suddenly aroused in the middle of the night by the dreadful tocsin, rushed in arms to the King's palace. At first they contented themselves with proving that their rights could not be violated with impunity, nor their indignation too long defied. They made signs

of peace to the Swiss, whom they still wished to treat as brothers; they received similar signs in return, and it was only when the Swiss violated these that their fury burst forth, and they sacrificed these cowardly satellites, who had been hired to betray them.

After describing the King's taking refuge in the Assembly and his deposition, Talleyrand concludes:

The Provisional Government offers to England the frankest expression of its friendship, its confidence, and its profound esteem for the people who were the first in Europe to win, and to keep, their freedom. It expects, in return, the like sentiments from the English nation, who should remember that when they themselves took possession of their sovereignty under circumstances more stormy, and by an event still more terrible, the Powers of Europe, and France in particular,\* did not hesitate to recognise the new Government which they had set up for themselves.

This document proves that if he possessed none of the masterfulness of Mirabeau, Talleyrand nevertheless had no small share of the great Tribune's powers of expression. The Provisional Government, however, did not think fit to send him back to London. On the other hand, Lord Gower, the English ambassador, was at once recalled from Paris. The awful massacres in the early part of September convinced Talleyrand that it was dangerous to remain in France. With great difficulty he contrived to obtain a passport from Danton. As soon as he reached London he took care to let it be known that he had no longer any sort of diplomatic mission, but with characteristic astuteness he told Lord Grenville that he should always be ready to be useful to his country. He himself afterwards asserted that he was sent by Danton to prevent the outbreak of hostilities between France and England.† No doubt he persuaded Danton to let him go for this purpose, but in his *Memoirs* he frankly acknowledges that his real object was to get away from France.

Thus ended the first stage of Talleyrand's diplomatic career. On reviewing it, I think that it deserves unqualified praise. His object was a noble one; the difficulties which he had to encounter on both sides were enough to discourage even the most sanguine. Yet, as far as he was concerned, his success was complete. The outrages of June 20, the overthrow of the monarchy—nay, even the bloody days of September, did not undo his work. It was not till after Louis' head had fallen on the scaffold that England

---

\* Mazarin concluded a treaty of peace with Cromwell. The soldiers of the Commonwealth fought side by side with those of Louis XIV. under the famous Marshal Turenne.

† Petition addressed to the Convention, 1795.

and France entered on the memorable struggle which lasted more than twenty years.

As we are here dealing only with Talleyrand's diplomatic correspondence we must touch but lightly upon the story of his life during the years 1793-1796. In spite of his services to his country, a warrant of accusation was issued against him (Dec. 7, 1792). He soon perceived that England would not long be a safe retreat. His first idea was to take refuge in Tuscany; but the Grand Duke refused to receive him. At length, in January 1794, he was ordered, under the provisions of the Alien Bill, to quit the kingdom within twenty-four hours.\* In February he set sail for America, where he remained until August 1796. His exile was most irksome to him. "Another year here," he wrote to Madame de Stael, "will kill me." The polished courtier had little in common with the rough colonists. Although his friend Lord Lansdowne had given him a cordial letter of introduction to Washington, the President refused to receive him. The newly framed Constitution, however, could not fail to interest him. His remarks upon it, addressed to Lord Lansdowne, are characterised by his usual sagacity:

How can America be anything but an English province, seeing that the characteristics of its Constitution, whether in the Federal Union or in the different States, are borrowed so manifestly from the English Constitution? Some of the States have ventured to depart from it, and not to reproduce an image of the triple legislative power—king, lords, and commons. Experience has punished them, and, what is rare, has enlightened them; and must not the respect for the English Constitution become extreme when it is acknowledged that success or failure depends upon a greater or lesser resemblance to it? What is the foundation of the liberty of the individual in America? The Habeas Corpus and the jury system. Go to the sittings of Congress and of the State Legislatures; follow the debates on the bills proposed. What do they cite? Whence do they take their analogies? Where do they look for precedents? In English law and in the customs and regulations of the Parliament of Great Britain. Go to the courts of justice; what is spoken of there? The Common Law, the statutes, and the cases of English courts. Lawyers have no books but what are written and printed in England. Surely, if such men are not altogether English, we must refuse to recognise the influence of law upon men, and we must deny that they receive any modification from their environment. It is in vain that the names "Republic" and "Monarchy" seem to make the two Governments utterly distinct. Any one who goes to the bottom of things must see that there is something of a republic in the English Legislature, and something of a monarchy in the

---

\* Pitt speaks of him at this time as "deep and dangerous."

American Executive. This will be especially the case as long as Washington is President. The force of opinion which attaches itself to his person, and which is growing every day, is the exact counterpart of the sort of magic power which public lawyers attribute to kings, a power which, indeed, at the present time, does not grow as constantly as the power of General Washington (Philadelphia, February 1, 1795).

About a year after his arrival he sent a petition to the Convention to be allowed to return to his own country. In it he set forth how he had quitted France by order of the Government, with a mission to London to prevent the impending war; how he alone among men of mark was singled out by Pitt for expulsion; that his labours in the cause of education and finance, and his zeal for the republican cause, entitled him to claim a reversal of the act of proscription against him. After considerable delay his request was granted. He left America, and stayed for some time at Hamburg; finally, he reached Paris in September 1796. His absence from France during the terrible years 1793-1796 saved his life, and, perhaps, his good fame. Had he remained, he would almost certainly have fallen under the guillotine; we may charitably hope that he would have had no hand in the bloody deeds of the reign of terror. For the first year after his return he held aloof from public affairs. But, as the course of events was tending to a cessation of hostilities, the Directory was anxious to secure the services of an able diplomat. In his *Memoirs* he tells us that it was with great reluctance that he was induced by Madame de Stael to call on Barras with a view to accepting office. Madame de Stael's account, and, indeed, Talleyrand's own letters, prove that he was highly gratified by the offer of the post of Minister of Foreign Affairs (July 16, 1797).

A vast change had taken place in the state of Europe during the years that had elapsed since Talleyrand had been relieved of his mission to London. In the autumn of 1792 the Austrian and Prussian troops were in full march on Paris, but the French coast was secure, since England still remained neutral. Now, however, the genius of Napoleon had made France the first of continental Powers, whereas England had become her bitter foe and the mistress of the seas. At the moment when Talleyrand once more entered on the scene, an attempt was being made to come to terms with England. Lord Malmesbury had been sent to Lille by Pitt, but it was commonly thought in France, though unjustly, that this was done merely to evade increasing difficulties at home. Bonaparte was encamped at Leoben, within a few days' march of Vienna, and had already (April 18) signed the preliminaries of peace with Austria. Talleyrand at once entered

into both negotiations. His duties were to draw up reports from time to time to be laid before the Directors, and to communicate their orders to the plenipotentiaries at Lille and Leoben. The reports are models of what State papers ought to be. They are written in clear and forcible language, while the arrangement of the materials is admirable. They show a wide knowledge of the state of the different kingdoms, and a keen insight into the character and aims of the men who ruled them. One long document, which fills more than a hundred pages of M. Pallain's second volume (pp. 243-346), embraces an account of every Power in Europe, and tenders advice to the Directors as to the line of conduct to be taken with each.\*

In the letters sent to the negotiators Talleyrand's hands were considerably tied. His predecessor, Delacroix, had abruptly broken off negotiations with England. Talleyrand, as we should expect, at once renewed them, and with some chance of success, had not Rewbell, the Director who had charge of the diplomatic department, overruled his efforts. As Mirabeau had observed, it was Talleyrand's misfortune to know what men should do, but to be without the strength of will to make them do it. The

---

\* The reader may care to see some of his remarks upon England. It must be borne in mind that the report was drawn up in July 1798. "The British Government has been from the beginning the soul of the great conspiracy formed against France; it has stirred up and advised and paid the successive factions which have stained the Revolution. England, not content with being a member of the coalition of kings, has proved herself to be its instigator, never ceasing to tighten up again the knots which are ready to be loosed, pouring over Europe her agents and her intrigues, terrifying some and enticing others, and lavishing her gold on those whom she sees about to desert so criminal and base a cause." After showing how England prevaricated as long as she saw any chance of a favourable outcome of the campaigns in Italy, he continues: "The Republic possesses very fair means of attack against England. If Bonaparte lands in Egypt the British power in India will be destroyed. Malta is already ours. . . . The Irish insurrection, cemented by the blood of some celebrated victims, seems to be making wonderful progress. It is to Ireland that all our efforts must be directed. We must hasten to send there arms, men, and stores, and so pay England back for all the evils she has done us. A republic rising up at her side would teach her, or, at any rate, would punish her. All her strength is in her commerce and in her navy. We harass her commerce by our privateers, by our laws, and by our treaties: her navy, we defy. Besides, how do we know that a mutiny may not soon break out on board her ships? More than a third of her sailors are Irish, and the love of their country may teach them to look upon the English as oppressors and enemies. [He adds in a note: 'Admiral Nelson's fleet is manned almost entirely by Irishmen, as I am assured by the Spanish Minister']. . . . Before treating with England we must do her much harm . . . and, in the event of a peace, we must make such arrangements as may secure for ever the freedom of the seas. We should have in England trusty secret agents. I used to have a very useful correspondence of this kind, but now it has ceased, and I feel the loss of it every day."



difficulty was this. During the war, England had seized many colonial possessions of France and her allies, Spain and the Batavian Republic; France, on the other hand, had overrun the provinces belonging to Austria, England's ally. Both parties agreed that there must be some mutual restitution, but they could not come to definite terms. Talleyrand himself was prepared to sacrifice the German and Italian conquests, but the young conqueror insisted on making his own terms. Meantime, fresh troubles broke out in Paris. In the recent elections the royalists had succeeded in returning more than two hundred members of their party. Pichegru, now an ardent supporter of the Bourbons, was nominated President of the Council of Five Hundred; another royalist became President of the Council of Ancients; and Barthélemy, who held monarchical opinions, became one of the Directors. It was clear that an attempt would be made to restore the Bourbons. Three of the Directors, however, determined to anticipate this by main force. The two victorious generals, Hoche and Bonaparte, lent their aid; the former sent troops, the latter a general, Augereau. On the 18th Fructidor (September 4, 1797) the refractory members were arrested, and shortly afterwards shipped off to Cayenne. Once again Talleyrand's skilful pen was made use of to explain to foreign Powers the violent acts of the *coup d'état*. His defence of the 18th Fructidor, considered as a State paper, is worthy to take its place beside his more famous apology for the overthrow of the monarchy on August 10, 1792. He begins by proving the existence of a conspiracy "entirely for the benefit of royalty," and bent on the destruction of the Republic; then he points out that the Constitution provided that extraordinary measures, even by arresting members, should be taken in case of supreme danger:

You will be told (he continues) that the Constitution has been violated, and this accusation will be made particularly by those whose real regret is that it was not destroyed. To this you will reply that the Constitution was almost overthrown, and that by means which it had not and could not have foreseen. From that moment it was necessary to take the only steps of setting it up again, and of strengthening it once for all. As soon as that was done, every subsequent act was carried out in the most orderly fashion, and in accordance with the provisions of the Constitution itself. . . . Such, then, will be your answer. You will add that the recent events have brought out the admirable qualities of our Directory; they show that it possesses the art of governing in a difficult crisis; that the French Republic can make use, both at home and abroad, of the most fruitful and energetic resources; that she has on her side that public spirit which, with Frenchmen, makes all things possible; and

that she has given a splendid proof of her vigour by triumphing, in an hour, and without a struggle, over the most terrible danger which she has yet encountered.

Although he composed and circulated this defence of the conduct of the Directors, the Foreign Minister had already perceived that the real centre of power was in the camp at Leoben, and that the youthful victor of Arcole and Rivoli was already the master of France. He had, indeed, expressed his indignation that a treaty of such importance should be entrusted to a general of twenty-eight, and that Bonaparte should have dared to boast that he would sooner march against the Government in Paris than against Vienna. But as soon as he was appointed Minister he took care at once to notify the same to the young general.

I have the honour to inform you, he wrote, that the executive Directory has nominated me as Minister of Foreign Affairs. Justly awed as I am by the perilous importance of my office, I am reassured by the thought that your glory will make negotiations easy. The mere name of Bonaparte makes everything smooth. I shall be eager to make known to you all the views which the Directory may charge me to transmit to you; whereas fame, which is your ordinary messenger, will rob me of the pleasure of giving information of the manner in which you will have carried them out.\*

It is interesting to note the contrast between the tone of the dispatches addressed to Lille, and the tone of those addressed to Leoben. The negotiators at the former place receive orders and complaints; Bonaparte, respectful advice and congratulations. When sending him the defence of the 18th Fructidor, Talleyrand wrote:

This despatch will give you the details, and will enable you to grasp the general scope of the Revolution which your superior mind must have foreseen. . . . The conduct of Augereau is perfect; it is easy to see that he was brought up in a good school.

He concludes: "Salut et respectueux attachement," instead of the customary "Salut et fraternité." Two days later (Sept. 8), he writes again:

The events of the 18th Fructidor must necessarily affect our foreign interests. They will prove to Europe the strength of our Government and the energy of the Republic, which has overcome its enemies at home with the ease with which you have scattered them abroad. . . . The tone of our negotiations must therefore be more lofty. This remark, as you may imagine, is not meant for

---

\* It is impossible to convey in a translation the subtle flattery of the original. Talleyrand, in his *Memoirs*, gives us to understand that Napoleon was the first to make advances. This letter disproves the insinuation.

you, who have assuredly not waited till now to make France speak the language which becomes her; but it seems to me that, as a consequence, you should bring more pressure to bear on the negotiations. If, with the Republic of Italy well established, we have the Rhine boundary, and Venice is not to belong to the Emperor, that would indeed be a peace worthy of Bonaparte.

In spite of the open disapproval of the Directors and the secret opposition of the Foreign Minister, peace was signed by Napoleon, at Campo Formio, on October 17, 1797. Early in December he returned to Paris, and met with an enthusiastic reception. On December 11, he was presented to the Directors by Talleyrand, who pronounced a most eloquent panegyric on his brilliant successes, but at the same time took care to claim for the Republic a share of the glory.\*

The negotiations at Lille came to an unsatisfactory conclusion, and the war continued. Great preparations were made for an invasion of England, which was to be conducted by Bonaparte. But a personal examination of the coast and the preparations that had been made, convinced him that the attempt would not succeed. English influence could be dealt a severe blow in a far different quarter. Talleyrand wrote to Sandoz (Feb. 22, 1798):

I am going to confide to you certain projects which are my own property. I have proposed an enterprise which will possibly extend the sphere of our colonies and light up the history of the world; it is to employ the 40,000 at present in Italy for the conquest of the most flourishing part of Egypt. We shall meet with little opposition there and immense resources for our commerce and a treasure for science.

Sandoz himself says in a letter written in the following April: "Talleyrand acknowledged to me that he was, with Magallon, the Consul in Egypt, the author of this great expedition, and that he expected from it the greatest success."†

The object of the expedition was explained at some length in a letter from the Foreign Minister to the French agent at Constantinople (Aug. 3, 1798):

The commerce of the Mediterranean must change its course and pass entirely into the hands of France. This is the secret desire of the Directory, and, moreover, it will be the inevitable result of our position on that sea. . . . To perfect our admirable position there, we must have Egypt—that country so long coveted by France.

\* The relations between Napoleon and Talleyrand are narrated, from the point of view of the latter, in the *Memoirs*. The portions published in the *Century Magazine* for February and March are entirely devoted to them.

† Talleyrand afterwards denied that he had anything to do with the proposal (*Gazette Nationale*, du 7 Thermidor an vii. [1799]).

Fortunately, the insolence of the beys towards us and the inability of the Porte to demand for us due satisfaction, give us the opportunity of entering and of establishing ourselves there without our being taxed with injustice or ambition. Is it a crime to chastise brigands? Our expedition, then, has apparently no other object but the reparation of our outraged rights and honour. It is on these lines that you should shape your conduct towards the Porte. In your conferences with its Ministers you will do your best to thoroughly convince them that the Directory has no idea of conquering Egypt, but merely wishes to take vengeance on the beys and mamelukes, the true enemies of both Powers; that the rights of the Porte in Egypt will be respected by us, and authority restored to the Pasha; that the Republic, recognising all forms of worship, will not interfere with those observed in Egypt; that the caravans on their way to Mecca will be disturbed as little as the Christian pilgrims journeying to Jerusalem; finally, you will make them understand that the true object of our arrival in Egypt is to be able to strike in India a deadly blow against England, our implacable foe. I confidently expect that these various considerations, put forward with your usual skill, will soothe the alarms of the Porte.

At the same time, I must not disguise from you that the Directory has no intention of evacuating Egypt, but rather of maintaining itself there by every means in its power. Mild measures, most in accordance with the principles of equity, will, of course, be preferred. We may count much upon the effects of time and custom to consolidate our rule.\*

The story of the Egyptian expedition does not concern us here. Bonaparte embarked at Toulon on May 19, 1798. Malta was captured on June 10. Three weeks afterwards Egypt was reached; the battle of the Pyramids was gained on July 21; but on August 1 the fleet was destroyed by Nelson. Two letters from Talleyrand deal with these events, and deserve to be quoted here. One was written to Sieyès, the *ci-devant* abbé, now envoy at Berlin:

The pleasure which I should have had in transmitting to you the message from the Directory is turned into pain by the bad news which you will find at the end of enclosed newspaper.

It seems but too certain that our fleet has been attacked, beaten, and destroyed by Nelson. . . . The details are frightful. The Admiral was killed; Duchayla and Dupetit-Thouars have also fallen. Only two ships appear to have escaped. The *Guillaume Tell* has returned to Malta without having lost a man or received a shot. Her captain, Villeneuve, has brought the news. How far can we believe a man who appears to have fled? What was the fleet doing at

---

\* This despatch, I admit, is thoroughly Macchiavellian. It might almost be taken for a letter written at the present time by an English Minister of Foreign Affairs to one of our agents in the East.

Alexandria? Instead of making for Corfu where, according to arrangements, it was to await the orders of the Government, why did it lie waiting for the enemy in a position in which no fleet has ever escaped defeat? I have reason to tell you that there is something inexplicable in this horrible affair. I have thought it my duty not to soften the details. It is better for you to hear them from us than from our enemies.

The other letter was written to Bonaparte himself, and *on the very same day* (September 15, 1798) as the letter to Sieyès:

It is with the liveliest eagerness, Citizen General, that I carry out the instructions of the Directors to transmit to you the testimony of their sincere satisfaction at the recent glorious services which you have rendered to the Republic since your departure from Toulon. Before expressing to you the joy which they felt at your astonishing and rapid conquest of Malta, and at your skill in deceiving the English Admiral, they were waiting for official news of your arrival and disembarkation in Egypt. . . .

The despatch contains not the slightest allusion to the disaster of the fleet!

During Napoleon's absence everything went wrong with the Directors. Talleyrand had already made secret arrangements with him to resign office and enter his service on the first favourable opportunity. The revolution of the 30th Prairial (June 18, 1799) showed that the Directory was doomed. The Foreign Minister accordingly threw up his portfolio on the 18th of July, and eagerly looked for Bonaparte's return.

T. B. SCANNELL.

## ART. V.—THE INSURRECTION IN CHILE.

1. *Reports of Her Majesty's Secretaries of Embassy and Legation.* Commercial, No. 14. 1876.
2. *Chili, 1879-80.* By R. NELSON BOYD. London: Messrs. Allen. 1881.
3. *La Guerra del Pacifico.* Per ARANO BARROS. Santiago 1880.

THE instability of democratic government in States of revolutionary origin is again being illustrated by events at the other side of the Atlantic. Chile, hitherto apparently exempt from the tendency of other Hispano-American Republics to lapse into the barbaric conditions of society, has now fallen under the same curse which has blighted the prosperity of her neighbours. Her previous immunity was generally regarded as in part due to the isolation resulting from her singular geographical configuration, in part to the absence from her territory of that mineral wealth which tainted the colonisation of the adjacent countries with the character of a rapacious hunt for treasure, and left behind it the doom with which ill-gotten wealth blasts communities as well as individuals.

No national enterprise was, perhaps, ever so visibly actuated by gold-hunger as the Spanish conquest of America, and none in Christian times was so darkly stained with wholesale treachery and inhumanity. Its legacy of injustice still rests like an incubus not only on the continent which was its scene, but on that other where it has reacted in the still worse horrors of the slave-trade. On its immediate authors it wreaked its own Nemesis in the evil passions it evoked. Quarrelling among themselves, like a band of pirates over their prey, they avenged on each other the wrongs of their common victims, and the unexhausted malediction drawn down by their crimes still clings, like that attached to the fabled hoard of German Saga, to the splendid inheritance they won. Their mother country, gorged for a time with the plunder of a hemisphere, dates her decadence from that plethora of prosperity, while the colonies she founded on the basis of unscrupulous race domination, were ruined by the sacrifice of all other forms of industry to the working of the mines, into which the native population was drafted, to the agricultural ruin of the country.

The oppression of the conquered people on the one hand, and social fusion with them on the other, resulting in the deteriora-



tion and almost obliteration of the European race, were alike due to the character of the Spanish colonisation as a wild rush for mineral wealth, on the part of adventurers rarely accompanied by European ladies. Intermarriage with natives, in combination with a miscellaneous tide of coloured immigration, has created in the Spanish-American colonies, where purity of descent in any class is rather the exception than the rule, the most singular amalgam of humanity in the world. To Iberian colonists, Spaniards and Portuguese alike, is wanting that invincible instinct or prejudice of caste which forbids the Anglo-Saxon to sell his birthright of race, and marks him out as a hereditary ruler of men, a type apart, among the many-tinged races over whom he holds sway. In no part of the world has there been, on the part of a transplanted British population, either in Australasia, South Africa, North America, or Hindustan, intermingling of race in any degree approximating to assimilation; and in the case of the latter dependency, at least, it may be safely affirmed that had it been so the British Empire would ere this have been like the Lusitanian, a scarce remembered dream. That the English home has thus preserved its unalloyed distinctiveness, even when transported to the remotest ends of the earth, is due to the spirit and courage of the women of England, who, bearing cheerfully their part in the hardships and struggles of exile, have had their full share in working out the imperial destiny of their race.

The Chileans, whose boast it is to style themselves "the English of the Pacific," have, in this respect, followed to a certain extent on the lines of British colonisation. The comparative poverty of their country in mineral wealth led to its settlement, with a view rather to the development of its agricultural resources, by a class of immigrants less unstable in their lives and habits than the fierce treasure-seekers of Peru. The semi-feudal system introduced by the bestowal of large grants of land on the colonists with "encomiendas" or villages of native peasants and labourers attached, created a territorial aristocracy proud of their unblemished white descent, and resenting as an insult any imputation on its purity. The same prejudice of colour obtained, to some degree, even among the poorer settlers, so that Chile, unlike its neighbours, has always had a white as well as an Indian labouring population. The steady policy of opposition to the introduction of negro or Chinese labour pursued by its Government, has impeded the further admixture of colour, so conspicuous in other parts of the continent. In Peru, for instance, the so-called whites form but 15 per cent. of a total, in which Indians count for 57, mixed races 24, negroes  $3\frac{1}{2}$ , and Chinese  $1\frac{1}{4}$  per cent. In La Paz, the capital of Bolivia, a city of 70,000 inhabitants, the blending

of colours has gone so far that Signor Gallenga \* tells us it would be difficult to point to 500, 50, or even five individuals of pure European descent. In both these countries Cholos, or Indian half-castes, form the bulk of the population, the European element tending to increasing effacement with every succeeding generation. Valparaiso is, in comparison, a white man's town, where the stigma of Indian descent, repudiated by all classes, is in the higher walks of life a positive bar to advancement. The permanence of racial and social distinction thus maintained in Chile, gave to its political institutions a stability wanting to those communities in which the restless hybrid element was all-powerful.

Its geographical position has no doubt contributed to the same result. For this shelf of littoral, fronting the ocean most remote from Western civilisation, is fenced off on its landward side from the bulk of the continent of which it forms part, by natural barriers so formidable as to give its territory almost the inaccessibility of an island. Forming for 2485 miles the Cornice of the Pacific, with an average breadth north of  $41^{\circ}$  of but 100 miles, it is hemmed in on the east by the "abysmal solitudes" of those "lonely pinnacles of the world," the Andes; on the north by the Atacama Desert, a waterless expanse barren of all forms of life; and on the south by the wrathful billows that gird the extremity of the continent with Antarctic desolation. While Bolivia and Peru, the adjoining Pacific States of South America, include within their dominions a large portion of the "montaña" or eastern declivity of the Andes, where a copious rainfall fosters vegetation into true tropical luxuriance, Chile, with the summit of that great range for her boundary, possesses only their steep and arid ocean slope, chilled and parched by the ungenial currents of air that set perennially from the South Pole. It is thus scarcely a figure of speech to say that no part of its soil is out of hearing of the guns of its ironclads, and this maritime character gives its inhabitants much of the hardihood and adventurous spirit of a seafaring population.

Its climate is so modified by this exceptional situation, that though extending within the southern tropic to  $18^{\circ} 28' S.$ , it may be classed throughout as a temperate region, and its southern provinces alone, screened by a continuous fringe of islands from the Antarctic currents of air, are, though furthest from the Equator, clothed by their copious rainfall in such exuberant vegetation as is generally associated with low latitudes. Its extreme length of 2800 miles, running nearly due north and south, is divided into three zones by strongly marked differences of climate and physical

---

\* "South America." By A. Gallenga. London: Chapman & Hall. 1880.

conditions. Their extremes are sufficiently characterised by the fact that the rainfall, absolutely *nil* in the north, amounts in the south to 102 inches per annum. The most northerly of these sections is the Atacama Desert, a waterless and lifeless tract extending over  $10\frac{1}{2}^{\circ}$  from the 29th to near the 18th parallel, where utter vegetative destitution is compensated for by extraordinary mineral wealth. The second is composed of a series of fertile upland valleys enclosed in the trough between the main Cordillera, or chain of the Andes, and its flying buttresses forming the Cordillera Maritima, or coast range. This intermediate zone forms the true heart and vital centre of the country, containing its capital, Santiago, its chief port, Valparaiso, and the bulk of its population. "El Sur," or Southern Chile, though thinly peopled and containing districts in which the native tribes are little more than nominally subdued, has greater natural capabilities than either of the two other divisions. It is still clothed, through great part of its extent, with primeval forest, rich in valuable timber, while the clearings furnish good agricultural and pastoral land.

The distribution of mineral wealth throughout the three zones is in an inverse ratio to their other capabilities, thus tending to equalise their general productiveness. For while the southern provinces contain extensive coal-fields, and the central some of the richest copper mines in the world, it is in the arid regions of the north that are found the still more valuable silver mines, as well as those deposits of nitrates and guano which are the principal sources of national revenue. Hence this desolate march between Chile and Bolivia, where all necessities of life, including water, have to be artificially supplied, was the bone of contention in the recent war of the Pacific, resulting in its incorporation *en bloc* in Chilean territory.

The Atacama Desert, thus become the prize of the successful belligerent, is a land resembling rather our conceptions of the lunar surface than one presenting the conditions of life prevailing on our own better equipped planet. Here, in the absence of all rain and dew, vegetation is non-existent, and the ridges and valleys which follow the direction of the main chain of the Andes are formed of bare rock, or covered only with loose sand and gravel. Yet this forbidding region hides, like the leaden casket, the choicest gifts of fortune under its unpromising exterior, and the nitrates and salts on its surface, and metalliferous veins beneath it, render it a veritable treasure-house, guarded by the demons of hunger and thirst. Its geological formation is, according to Mr. Boyd, whose work we quote as a heading, plutonic intermixed with stratified porphyries, but at the base of the Andes the limestones of the Jurassic period crop out,

and contain the rich silver lodes for which the desert has become so famous.

The aspect of the coast is most repelling, as it fronts the sea in an uninterrupted wall of brown and barren rock for the seven hundred miles from Huasco to Callao. The land ascends steeply to a height of 1500 or 2000, and more gradually to 8000 or 10,000 feet, the peaks of the Andes rising sharply from these lower eminences. This dreary landscape is seen under a lowering sky, charged with clouds brought up from the chill south, though forbidden to melt into showers by the warmer land temperature they meet. The ports, Caldera, the second in the Republic, Iquique, Chañarel, and Pisagua, are mere depôts for the export of minerals, dependent on distillation for their water, and on importation for their food. The latter, built on a mere shelf of rock, was the scene of a celebrated feat of arms on the part of the Chilean troops, who escalated the steep heights in its rear under an almost vertical fire from their Peruvian enemies. From Chañarel, a railway, twenty-two miles in length, carries provisions, consisting of distilled water, and jerked beef or "charqui," to the colony of miners engaged in the extraction of nitre.

The latter is found in the desert in beds several feet in thickness, covered only by a few inches of pebbles, salt, or gypsum. Circular pits or fissures on the surface generally indicate the presence of the deposits, which occupy well-defined basins, apparently the beds of desiccated lakes, of which the sloping edges are richest in mineral. The "caliche della pampa," as it is called, contains 15 to 20 per cent. of "salitre," or nitrate of soda, with magnesium, common salt, and a small quantity of iodine as associated substances; the latter a valuable bye-product, even when found in a less proportion than 0.12 per cent. The nitre is extracted by a process resembling that used for rock-salt, the pounded mineral being passed through a series of dissolving and precipitating tanks at successively descending levels. Nitrates owe their value to their fertilising qualities, for which they are in especial demand by growers of beet. The exportation amounted in 1888 to a value of over 33,000,000 dollars, and a weight of 750,050 tons, or 16,700,000 quintals, of which 15,000,000 were shipped to Europe, and 1,700,000 to the United States.

Recent vicissitudes in the nitrate industry are owing to increased competition since its appearance, as a form of speculative investment on the European Stock Exchanges. The large profits realised by the original proprietors when production was on a comparatively limited scale, fell away with its vast increase under the stimulus given by the purchase of nitrate properties on behalf

of joint-stock companies. Natural causes have, however, combined with artificial ones in introducing fluctuations into the trade.

Earthquakes and tidal waves [says Consul Newman in his Report to the Foreign Office on the nitrate industries of Chile in 1889] have twice in the last twenty years caused a great destruction of life and property in the ports, and, lastly, the Chilean-Peruvian war left its mark. After the conclusion of the war, producers had a good time for some years, and this induced increased production till prices began to fall. By 1884 matters were so bad as to cause very serious anxiety among the banks and merchants who had dealings in the nitrate districts. By-and-by it became clear that a limitation of production was an absolute necessity, and this was carried out, though with many difficulties and uncertainties, which for a time robbed it of part of its effect in steadying prices. The principle on which the limitation was agreed on was a percentage of the possible output of each oficina; consequently, each oficina claimed as large an output as possible. The producers who were strong enough financially to stand a period of losing prices, had to be persuaded to come into the combination by being allowed to produce more than their fair share, and when better times came they made large profits. Naturally this brought in a fresh set of producers, and it is questionable if the combination could have been longer maintained. Fortunately at this juncture consumption expanded wonderfully in Europe, and all the producers made money, working as hard as they could.

The inevitable consequence of this epoch of prosperity was a fresh outbreak of speculation, in which the shares of the leading Nitrate Company, the *Primitiva*, were run up by the eagerness of investors to a premium of 600 per cent. The year 1888 was signalised by large purchases of nitrate properties on behalf of English joint-stock companies, whose shareholders have had to face a fresh period of depression owing to the present political struggle in the country. Restriction of production may, however, have its attendant compensation in enhancement of price, as Chile enjoys a practical monopoly of the article. Even previously, however, investors had been warned, in the Report just quoted, against extravagant hopes of large returns, although it declares the business as a whole to be established on a sound natural basis. The cost of production of a quintal of nitrate, shipped for exportation, but exclusive of freight, was estimated by it on June 3, 1889, at 2 dols. 46 cents against a selling price of 2 dols. 60 cents.

This calculation [says the writer] takes no account of interest or depreciation. Several of the new oficinas can produce considerably cheaper, and one or two might get down as low as 2 dols. 5 cents;

the variable item is the first, namely, *cost placed in bulk in the oficina*. This depends on the quality of the raw material, its distance from the works, and the class of machinery employed. The latest oficinas have, of course, the latest modern improvements. The business is profitable enough at present, but we have seen nitrates as low as 2 dols. 15 cents, in which case, perhaps, only five oficinas could produce it at a bare covering price.

The fact that the Chilean Government is dependent, to a large extent, for its revenue on the export duty on nitrate, hampers producers in resorting to the usual remedy of restricting output in order to enhance price, as it is the general impression that the consequent diminution of revenue would have to be met by an increase of taxation. Even before the drain on the resources of the country by the present calamitous struggle, such an expenditure had been incurred on public works, construction of railways, docks, and piers, as well as on ironclads and war material, as was only justified by the large revenue derived from the tax on nitrates. From this source, indeed, is derived more than a third of the total receipts of the national exchequer, nitrates contributing 21,000,000 dollars, against 20,500,000 levied as import duties, to a total of 56,000,000. The future of nitrates as an investment is thus complicated by political as well as commercial perturbations.

To the south of the desolate coast whence this mineral is exported lies the great silver port of Antofagasta, won from Bolivia in the war of the Pacific, as the nitrate province of Tarapaca was from Peru. A length of sixty miles of railway leads hence to the mines of Caracoles, whose name, in Spanish signifying snails, is a descriptive one, derived from the number of Ammonites found in the Jurassic formation. Here, on the flanks of the Andes, at an altitude of 10,000 feet above the sea, over 4000 mines have been registered, the ores of some of which yield chloride of silver in the proportion of 60, and mercury in that of 2 per cent. The export of ore from Antofagasta, whence nitrates are shipped as well, amounted in one year to £75,000. Another rich silver and nitrate district, that of Chañarel, is reached from Caldera, whence six million dollars' worth of mineral produce are exported in the course of the year. The railway hence to Copiapo is the oldest in Chile, and its effect in stimulating the production of the precious metal may be inferred from the haste made on its construction to pull down walls and houses built from the "relaves" or refuse ores, which, though containing sixty ounces of silver to the ton, had not previously been worth the cost of transport. The name of Copiapo has always been associated with mineral spoil, for it was here that the Inca Manco, who accompanied Almagro the conqueror of Chile, caused



the inhabitants to bestow on the Spaniards their golden treasures, amounting to a million of dollars.

The copper coast succeeds that behind which lies the region of silver, and here we have Huasco, which exports the produce of the Freirina, one of the richest known copper districts, whose mines of Correal influence the price of the metal in all the markets of the world. Coquimbo comes next, where ores from the mines of Panulcilla, Tamaya, and others are smelted in the great establishment of the firm of Urmeneta and Errazuriz. Although Chile can no longer claim, as she once did, to regulate the price of copper for the world at large, she is at least a large factor in its production, her specialty being the rougher sort specifically known as Chile bars. The ferocity common to all mining populations finds vent, among the copper miners of Chile, in a singular form of duel, in which the adversaries in any serious quarrel fight with their left legs tied together, until one or other falls dead or mortally wounded.

The copper and coal regions overlap, both minerals being found in juxtaposition to the south of Valparaiso, in the neighbourhood of the port of Coronel. Here are situated the mines of Puchaco and Playa Negra, which supply the smelting works of Lota, owned by the Cousiño family, proprietors also of the largest collieries in Chile. Further south are the Lebu coal-mines, owned by the family of Errazuriz, while the islands of Chiloe and the province of Valdivia are known to contain large deposits, as yet little worked.

The enumeration of the mineral treasures of Chile by no means, however, exhausts the list of its resources, since, as an agricultural and pastoral country, it has capabilities scarcely less great. Its central division consists, broadly speaking, of one great valley lying between the parallel Cordilleras, and of the steep lateral valleys dividing their buttressing ranges. Here wheat, maize, and other cereals are grown in such abundance as to leave a considerable surplus for exportation, although of the total area classed as cultivable throughout the country, only one-thirteenth is actually under cultivation. So far afield does Chile find her markets that even remote England takes some of her produce, drawing on the golden vale of Huasco, the Vega of Aconcagua, and other Andean slopes, for a portion of the food of her redundant population.

The agricultural development of Chile dates from 1848, previous to which the cultivation of cereals was not considered lucrative, and only sufficient grain was raised for home consumption.

The discovery of gold in California in 1849 [says Mr. (now Sir) Horace Rumbold, author of the Report among our headings] changed

the whole aspect of things. The exports in wheat and flour alone increased nearly fourfold in two years, and sevenfold in seven, Chile, as the nearest available market, supplying the wants of the swarms of adventurers of all nations who flocked to the Californian shores. This happy state of things went on for a few years, large fortunes being realised in the Californian trade at Valparaiso and other Chilean ports; but, as early even as 1852, the Ministerial Report above quoted foresaw that such a run of luck could not be of long duration, that the fertile regions of California and Oregon would soon grow enough to support themselves, while the railway building across the Isthmus of Panama, and the new class of clippers carrying grain and other produce from New York round the Horn to San Francisco, in the same time that ordinary vessels took to reach that port from Valparaiso, would help to drive Chile from her newly acquired Californian market. These previsions were speedily realised, the trade with California collapsing as speedily as it had arisen.

The exports to that country, amounting in 1850 to nearly 2,500,000 dollars, of which upwards of 1,500,000 were for grain and flour, had fallen in 1855 to 275,763, and in 1858 to 178,484 dollars, the breadstuffs supplied to San Francisco in that year being valued only at 15,600 dollars.

But at the very time [continues the Report] when the Californian Eldorado was eluding the Chilean producers, a fresh but likewise transient outlet was opened to them by the Australian gold discoveries. The trade with Australia lasted only a few years (1853-1859), but in 1855 the exports represented a value of no less than 2,698,911 dollars, of which 2,541,692, or £500,000 sterling, were for wheat and flour.

Meanwhile equally remote and unforeseen causes were combining to assure to Chile a valuable and far steadier customer in her nearest neighbour. Peru, which in the last century sent wheat to Chile, and raised an abundance of grain, cattle, potatoes, and other kinds of food, had by degrees neglected her production and had taken to tropical husbandry, such as cotton and sugar-cane planting. The war in the United States for a time made cotton planting so lucrative as to turn Peruvian capital yet more in that direction. Thus Chile, who from the first year of which her statistics keep any record had supplied her neighbour with an average value of 250,000 dollars of breadstuffs, now found an outlet for five times that amount. The general conditions of her trade with Peru have indeed been completely reversed in the last thirty years. In 1845 she imported from Peru to the value of 1,474,889 dollars, and exported thither to the amount of 674,552 dollars. In 1863, her imports from that country had fallen to 701,297 dollars, and her exports to it had risen to 2,619,386 dollars. In 1874 the imports from Peru figured for 1,947,770 dollars, but her exports thither attained the far higher value of 6,016,413 dollars. Peru now

stands second (next to Great Britain, but a long way behind her) in the list of nations who take Chilean produce, while as an importer into Chile she comes in only for the sixth place. To the Chilean grain growers Peru affords the steadiest of markets. The wheat and flour exported thither during the last four years amounted to an average yearly value of 1,900,000 dollars, or £380,000. During the same period Peru likewise took each year 870,000 dollars worth of barley, or nearly two-thirds of the export of that grain, most of the remainder being taken by Bolivia.

Chile's export of breadstuffs to England, insignificant before 1861, expanded in that year to 769,366 dollars' worth, second only to that to Peru. This figure, grown in 1869 to nearly a million, showed in 1871 and 1874 a further increase to 3,032,809 and 6,457,945 respectively, an eightfold increase in thirteen years, representing considerably more than half the total sent out of the country. Yet so vast is the demand of the English market, that though this last and the preceding year were exceptionally favourable to the Chilean importer owing to the great failure of European crops, but a twentieth and twenty-eighth of its total imports were then met from this source.

Of the total export trade of Chile, 80 per cent., amounting to 73,000,000 dollars, was, according to the official figures for 1888, transacted with this country, while she derived nearly half her imports, to the value of 26,000,000 out of 60,000,000 dollars, from the United Kingdom. Cotton goods, railway plant and machinery, form the largest items of the latter, and of the former copper bars and other mineral produce.

The rural industry of Chile is hampered by scarcity of labour, due not only to the competition of the mines, which employ about half the population, but to a large drain of foreign emigration, amounting in some years to 30,000 out of a total of under three million inhabitants. This movement forms in itself presumption of the dissatisfaction of the rural classes with the original conditions of their lives. The existing land system of Chile is an outgrowth of that established by the conquest, as the prevailing form of servile tenure is derived from the "encomiendas," or grants of native labourers with the land, in their original constitution legally abolished in 1791. It has been succeeded by occupaney terminable at will, the *corvée* or labour rent being the equivalent given. Although not necessarily more irksome than payment in money or kind, this class of partnership in land tends to keep husbandry, whether that of the proprietor or the tenant, in a backward and slovenly condition. The services which the "inquilinos," or resident peasantry on a Chilean estate, are called upon to perform for the owner, as "brazos obligados," or compulsory hands, are in the case of

wealthier occupants discharged vicariously by the "peones" or day labourers hired by them.

This unpaid service or *corvée* [says Mr. Rumbold] is the distinctive feature of the system known as "inquilinaje," but the amount of service required of the "inquilino," in person or by deputy, varies greatly on different estates, and is determined by custom or voluntary agreement. For the rest, and by far the greater portion of his work, the poorer "inquilino" receives ordinary payment as a day labourer, and, indeed, in some parts of the country the unpaid service to which the "inquilinos" are bound seems to be confined to such exceptional cases as "rdeos," or the driving in of the cattle at stated intervals from their hill pastures to the "corral," where they are to be branded or selected for the market, or else "trillas," or threshing done by mares, where the modern steam-threshing machinery has not yet been introduced. On certain estates, again, they are only called on to furnish night-patrols to protect the house of the owner, and watch the live stock in their badly enclosed grazing grounds, no light task in a country where "abijeato," or cattle-stealing, is one of the commonest of offences.\* In general it would appear as if paid labour were by degrees taking the place of unpaid service, the "inquilino" being thus gradually transformed into a salaried labourer, for whom a cottage and a patch of ground are provided, as on some English estates. The daily wages of agricultural labourers vary between 20 and 40 cents, sometimes rising as high as 50, or falling as low as 10 cents. The average of wages has increased considerably of late years.

There is no written contract between the proprietor and the "inquilino," an oral agreement terminable at will being the only definition of their relations. The instability of the arrangement may tell against either party to it, according as land or labour is in greater demand, but it tends in any case to deterioration of the holding, compensation for unexhausted improvements on which is absolutely unknown. An additional element of precariousness is introduced into all land contracts by the pernicious form of taxation known as the "alcabala," a duty of 4 per cent. on the rent charged on all leases for a period exceeding ten years. Nine years and eleven months is therefore the universal term, and as most Chilean estates are underlet to middlemen, who are the actual farmers, the result is to make them, in the words of one of their number, "the enemies of the land they cultivate." The system is prohibitory, for instance of the culture of the grape, as vines only begin to bear in the fifth year, and restricts agriculture to crops which yield an immediate

---

\*In the judicial statistics for 1873, 562 out of a total of 3275 criminal offences in the whole territory of the Republic are put down to cattle stealing.

return. The lessee is of course equally precluded, even were he so disposed from granting a lease to the "inquilino," although he may, like the landlord in chief, eject him at pleasure.

This servant of the glebe, nevertheless, despite his nominal dependence, has many advantages over the peasant proprietor in countries where the subdivision of holdings renders him the slave of the usurer or the tax-gatherer. These "remote sunburnt countries," as Carlyle calls them, have at least the merit of giving elbow-room to the human family in their amplitudes of scantily peopled soil. The "inquilino" of the better class generally receives, in addition to his "rancho," or hut, a plot of arable and meadow land, varying on good estates between four and six "cuadras" (the "cuadra" is over three acres), on which he is allowed to maintain a certain number of animals, amounting in some cases to eight oxen, nine cows, sixty sheep, and seventeen horses, so that the "inquilinos" on one property are said to own five hundred head of cattle. From their class, too, are taken the "sirvientes del campo," or farm bailiffs, the "capataz," or overseer of all the herdsmen and labourers, and the head "vaquero" in charge of the cattle of the "hacienda." These functionaries receive small fixed salaries, and the former sometimes a commission of 2 per cent. on the harvest, so that they have been known to rise from their state of semi-serfdom to proprietorship, by buying out the improvident, and often absentee, owners.

Far lower, however, than that of even the poorer "inquilinos" is the condition of the "peones," or day labourers, who, without fixed abode or family ties, form a true proletariat, living on precarious earnings, and leading a more or less vagrant life. To these supernumeraries of labour, the mines and foreign emigration offer a welcome resource, pending the time when the development of the latent capabilities of Chile shall have provided improved opportunities of existence for all her sons at home.

The sordid domestic surroundings of the "huaso," as the Chilean countryman is called, are probably due rather to his own low standard of living, than to actual want of means to improve them. In point of fact they are but little removed from barbarism, or rather the "rancho" of branches in which he and his family huddle together with but scant protection from often inclement weather, is a degree lower in the scale of comfort than the wigwam of the Red Indian or the grass hut of the Central African.

It is true [says the Report before us] that on many "haciendas" far better huts have of late years been provided for them by the landlord; but it is a frequent though hardly intelligible complaint, that they do not appreciate the advantages, of superior dwellings, and certainly, as a rule, their habitations may be said to be much of the same class as the "lines" in which on tropical estates (in

Ceylon, for instance), the gangs of hired coolies are housed at harvest time. Their food is exclusively vegetable, consisting of "frijoles" (the haricot or kidney bean), or sometimes a mess of "harina tostada" (grilled wheat flour), cooked with lard, and unleavened bread made of the coarser kinds of flour, ingredients which constitute a wholesome rather than inviting dish.\* The haricot bean, which is the staple of their food, is, however, highly nutritious, and on it they perform an extraordinary amount of heavy field work, beginning with sunrise and ending at sunset; and thus, in summer-time, labouring for little less, on an average, than thirteen hours a day, with a rest of half an hour at 9 A.M. for breakfast, and for another hour at midday for dinner; and this, be it remembered, under a sky as pitilessly scorching as that of Southern Italy or Greece, and without the support of any sort of stimulant, neither wine nor beer, nor any other liquor being allowed them from the estate. The dreary monotony of lives so toilsome is not unnaturally broken by bouts of revelry, when a week's, or maybe a month's, hard earnings are wasted in a few wild hours at the "despacho," a combination of village store and public-house; the women, meanwhile, sitting listlessly at home, and both they and their numerous offspring frequently faring but badly.

The national beverage of the Chileans is Paraguayan tea, or "yerba de mate," so called from the gourd out of which it is drunk. A silver bowl, in which it is infused, with the addition of sugar, is its more aristocratic receptacle, and from this it is sucked through a silver or other metal tube with a perforated bowl. The favourite dishes are "cazuela," broth with chicken or meat, and potatoes or vegetables boiled in it, "puchero," a variation on this, and "valdiviano" soup, made of "charqui," or jerked beef, potatoes and onions.

An obvious difference of race separates the "hacendados" or Chilean landowners, pure Spaniards still holding in some cases the great fiefs bestowed on their ancestors at the conquest, from the lower orders of the population. On such a scale were their original estates, that it was a popular saying some half century ago that the whole country between Valparaiso and the capital, ninety miles as the crow flies, was owned by three proprietors—one of them claiming lineal descent from Hernan Cortez. Alterations in the laws of inheritance have broken up many of these wide domains, while others have been alienated by owners, drawn

---

\* The regulation rations of the Chilean labourer, according to M. Balmaceda, only consist, for the first meal, of the fifteenth part of an almud (about 1 lb) of flour, or a loaf of that weight; and for the second meal, of the same quantity of beans or maize, cooked with grease or lard; a third, loaf of bread and a dish of "frangollo," or bruised corn, is furnished them for supper on most estates.



from their country homes by the charms of the aristocratic society of Santiago.

The census in Chile gives only an approximate estimate of the population, believed to be over 3 000,000, but registered far below that figure, from the fear of the peasantry that their enumeration was the prelude either to a capitation tax or a *levée en masse*. On the eve of that taken on April 19, 1875, whole villages were left half deserted, as the "peones" fled from their huts to seek a refuge in the mountains. Difficulties of another sort arose in the cities from the crowding of the poorer quarters, and the repetition of the same names in the very numerous families. One "conventillo," or blind alley of Santiago, contained 400 inhabitants, as many as twenty-five occupying a single room, while out of eighty-six inhabitants of one house twenty-five gave the name of Gomez, and fourteen that of Gonzalez.

In Southern Chile rural life has all the picturesqueness derived from contact with primitive nature, in an unreclaimed country where man is still but an intruder on her domain. It is practically inaccessible save by sea, as it is cut off from the northern provinces by the intervening Indian territory of Araucania, where the aborigines, successful rebels against Inca and Spanish rule alike, have only recently acknowledged the sovereignty of Chile, and still live in semi-savage independence, to the number of 70,000 or 100,000, under the sway of their caciques or hereditary chiefs. Northern and Southern Chile are at the opposite poles of climate as far as rainfall is concerned, and the traveller who leaves Valparaiso blasted by perpetual drought, may land at Port Montt to find a country on which the cataracts of heaven have been pouring for three or four weeks together. Whole tracts are shrouded to the water's edge in primeval forest, emerald green under the weeping skies, and the chief export is timber, of which many varieties are little, if at all, inferior to the much prized woods of Brazil.

The coast, sheltered like that of its northern antitype, British Columbia, by a fringe of islands, forms, like it too, a series of landlocked channels, to which correspond a chain of lakes extending along hundreds of leagues in the interior, the largest, that of Llanquihue, measuring some thirty-three miles each way. This diversity of land and water gives panoramic change of aspect to some of the most beautiful scenery in the world, as its vistas alike on lake and sea open up the ever present Cordillera of the Andes, its volcanoes Osorno and Cabbuco, and the great Tronador or Thunderer, crowning with pyramids of snow the uplifted greenery of its flanks.

The principal rural settlements here are composed of German

colonists, who constitute in some of them a good half of the population, and it is a strange sensation to find sauer-kraut and Lager beer the prevailing delicacies, and the "Wacht am Rhein" the pervading melody on these remote Pacific shores. The island of Juan Fernandez, immortal as the abode of Alexander Selkirk, *alias* Robinson Crusoe, is also occupied by a German colony, having been purchased with that intent in 1868 by Robert Wehrdan, a Saxon engineer.

Land in Valdivia is to be had for less than one dollar an acre, and labour is cheap, though scarce. The harvest is reaped by gangs of temporary immigrants from the adjoining islands, distinguished as Chilotes, from the Chileños of the mainland. The interior is throughout almost uninhabited, and the forest of the Patagonian region is an unbroken solitude. The Chilean settlement of Punta Arenas, or Sandy Point, planted amid the majestic desolation of Magellan's Straits, is noteworthy as the most southern civilised community in the world, justifying its title to be so classed by the possession of a school in which 100 pupils receive instruction. The climate, despite a heavy snowfall, is not too rigorous to grow the hardier cereals, but its principal resources are its seal-fisheries, and its trade in guanaco skins and ostrich feathers.

The frontier of Chile on the south, long in dispute with her neighbours, was, unlike her northern boundary, determined by pacific agreement. Her claim to some of the eastern shore of Patagonia was abandoned in 1881, when, by treaty with the Argentine Republic, a line bisecting Tierra del Fuego was accepted as the limit between the sister States. The delimitation of the South American Republics, after they had thrown off the Spanish yoke, was based upon what was called the *uti possidetis* of 1810, or limits of the several viceroyalties, as they then existed. But the definition of outline which had been sufficiently exact as between the provinces of the united empire, proved too vague to determine the contending sovereignties of States. The Constitution of Chile, proclaimed in 1833, declares that "the territory of Chile shall extend from the Desert of Atacama to Cape Horn, and from the Cordillera of the Andes to the Pacific Ocean, including the Archipelago of Chiloe, all the adjacent islands, and Juan Fernandez."

Those who drew up this declaration little imagined that the Desert of Atacama, then regarded as an uninhabitable marsh between Chile and her northern neighbours, should one day become the most valuable portion of the territory of either, whose possession should only be decided by a sanguinary war. When, in 1866, deposits of nitrate and borax were discovered in this region by Chilean subjects, a clumsy compromise was made, by

assigning to Bolivia the absolute sovereignty as far as the 24th parallel, but establishing between the 23rd and 25th a sort of joint ownership with Chile, with whom all royalties and dues collected over this debateable land were to be divided. As this condition was, in practice, never observed, Chile consented in 1874 to waive her claim altogether, leaving her rival in undisputed possession of the entire border.

Its commercial capabilities, meanwhile, were entirely developed by Chilean capitalists, who under concessions from the Bolivian Government had made roads, water-cisterns, and piers, entirely creating the port of Antofagasta. The discovery and working of the silver mines of Caracoles was also due to Chilean enterprise, which had to overcome the difficulty of transporting from the coast all supplies of food, water and forage. The conclusion of an offensive and defensive alliance between Bolivia and Peru in 1873 encouraged the former in a policy of fiscal aggression. Nitrates were declared a State monopoly, and while one decree compelled mine-owners to sell exclusively to the Government at a fixed rate, another restricted their right of production so as to enhance the selling price for the benefit of the latter. Other confiscatory decrees followed with the result of transferring the activity of mining operations to Peruvian and Chilean territory.

To these wrongs was added the imperfect legal protection afforded to foreigners, when the revolution in Bolivia in 1876, and the accession to power of General Daza, a "cholo," or Indian half-caste, was followed by general anarchy on the frontier. Crimes of violence, for which the Bolivian tribunals gave no redress to Chilean subjects, were of every-day occurrence, while an arbitrary increase in the duties still further diminished the value of their property. The act which led to the final rupture between the countries was the repudiation by Bolivia, on February 1, 1879, of the treaty of 1872, accompanied by a decree withdrawing the concession of the Chilean Nitrate Company, and ordering the compulsory sale of its property. The war of the Pacific began with the despatch of a Chilean expedition to Antofagasta on February 14, to prevent the execution of this decree. The troops were received with enthusiasm, the majority of the inhabitants being of their own nationality, and occupied the country without opposition up to the 23rd parallel, liberating the captured Bolivian garrisons.

The State thus attacked was not in a condition to repel invasion, being devastated by famine, while the principal care of its President was to prohibit the promulgation in the capital of the news of the taking of Antofagasta, lest it might interfere with the festive celebration of his birthday, and other carnival gaieties then going on. The war consequently resolved itself into a

naval duel between Peru and Chile, in which the seamen of the latter displayed a gallantry worthy of the traditions of a service founded by a British hero. In a remarkable engagement fought off Iquique, on May 21, 1879, the wooden corvette *Esmeralda*, the capture of which from the Spaniards under the guns of Callao was one of the most brilliant feats of Lord Dundonald, made an end which that great captain himself might have been proud of. Sunk at last by the superior metal of her adversary, the ironclad *Huascar*, armed with 300-pounders, she went down with colours flying, while her tiny consort, the gunboat *Cavadonga*, lured the second Peruvian ironclad, the *Independencia*, on the rocks, there to become a total wreck. The result of a subsequent engagement on June 9 of the following year, in which the ironclads *Huascar* and *Cochrane* were the champions of Peru and Chile respectively, was to leave the latter mistress of the seas, and to secure to her eventually the possession of the whole of the disputed territory, of the nitrate and guano districts of Tarapaca, of the port of Antofagasta, and of the rich silver mines of Caracoles.

The material development of Chile is mainly a creation of British enterprise, which first furnished it with adequate means of communication with the rest of the world. A sailing vessel despatched from Callao two or three times a year, and long and anxiously looked for at Valparaiso, was, until fifty years ago, the sole bearer of intelligence and merchandise to Chile from any point outside her own dominions. From this position of isolation she was delivered by the formation of the Pacific Steam Navigation Company, the idea of which, first started by William Wheelwright, a native of the United States, resident in Valparaiso as a shipbuilder and engineer, was adopted in England, after having been previously rejected by his own countrymen. Two steamers, the *Peru* and *Chile*, the precursors of a great fleet, sailed from Liverpool in 1840 to ply between Callao and Valparaiso, making the voyage round Cape Horn under canvas, while their machinery was conveyed across the Atlantic to Colon, and thence over the Isthmus to Panama. The enterprise was not at first a financial success, but the company, undiscouraged by five years during which it was carried on at a loss, extended their voyages in 1847 to Panama, and prospered so well as to be able to double in 1859 their original capital of a quarter of a million (now four millions sterling), and to establish in 1868 a monthly, which soon became a fortnightly, steam service between Liverpool and Valparaiso. They maintained their supremacy in the Pacific against the efforts of the Messageries Maritimes and another French company, of the White Star line, and the Royal Belgian Mail to contest it with them, and they have now only two competitors,

the "Kosmos" line from Hamburg, and a Chilean company receiving a subsidy of £20,000 a year from the Government. These are rather subsidiaries than rivals to the English line, which in addition to conveying to Europe 2500 tons of cargo twice a month, has a practical monopoly of the local trade between Chile and Peru. A statue of Mr. Wheelwright in one of the principal squares of Valparaiso indicates the light in which he is regarded by his adopted country as one of its national benefactors.

The railways of Chile cover a length of 1498 miles, and are all the property of the State. The principal lines are that linking Valparaiso to the capital with a branch to the foot of the Andes, another running longitudinally along the central valley, and several short lengths connecting the various mining districts with the coast. Contracts have been signed for 600 miles in addition, comprising the extension of the present trunk line through Araucania to the southern provinces, and lines opening up some of the mining districts in the north, as far as Huasco and Vallenar. More ambitious and remote is the project of a Transandine line, to run from Santa Rosa de los Andes in Chile, to Mendoza, the terminus of the railway on the Argentine side, with a mountain section of 70 kilomètres, of which two-fifths would be over 3000, and one-fifth over 3200 mètres high. The steepest gradient would be 1 in 25 for a short distance only, and the estimated cost is £2,400,000. The danger of importing cholera or yellow fever by a route which would bring Valparaiso within forty-eight hours of Buenos Ayres, is one of the objections made to its construction on the part of the former.

The honourable position hitherto held by Chile among South American Republics, as the one exception to their record of civil convulsions, has been forfeited within the last few months. She owed this exemption in a great degree to the self-control of one of her citizens on the occasion of the last internecine struggle to which she was a prey. This was in 1851, when the exasperation of the Liberal party at the triumph of the Conservatives in the election to the presidency of Don Manuel Montt, led to a military revolt headed by General Cruz, the defeated candidate.

At this critical juncture it was [says Mr. Rumbold] that the outgoing President placed his sword at the disposal of the new. To appreciate the conduct of General Bülmes on this occasion, it should be borne in mind that, although an influential leader of the party which had installed Montt, he is known to have been opposed to the selection of Montt as the candidate of that party; further, that he was bound by ties of close relationship to Montt's competitor; and, lastly, that his renown and popularity, as the victor of Yungay and conqueror of Peru, were such as might well have tempted a more ordinary man from the strict path of duty and military discipline.

Moreover, his offer of service was entirely spontaneous, and he might, without loss of reputation, have held entirely aloof from the dissensions of the State. The election of M. Montt being, however, legal in his eyes, he did not hesitate to support it. After a short campaign he met the forces of his kinsman General Cruz, at Lonesmilla, and overthrew them after a hard fought and sanguinary engagement. To his bearing at this momentous crisis, Chile in great measure owes her enviable freedom from the manifold evils which up to the present day afflict the surrounding sister republics, and have made the bulk of South American history a disheartening record of barrack revolutions, too often stained with political assassination. He gave the death-blow to militarism in this country, and when in 1859 at the close of M. Montt's second term of office, fresh political disturbances arose, they were easily quelled by a staunch and undivided army.

The most noteworthy feature of the present calamitous civil war is the division of the elements between the contending parties, the President, with the control of the bulk of the army, purchased, it is said, by wholesale promotions and promises of pay, being supreme on land, as his adversaries, who command the fleet, are at sea. The struggle appears to turn on constitutional rather than personal questions, and in face of the contradictory statements of the two parties, it is impossible to apportion the merits between them. The failure to summon congress to vote the Continuance Acts for maintaining the naval and military forces at the end of the year, has placed the President in a position of technical illegality, and he has been warned by the responsible officials that all treasury warrants for public expenditure have ceased to be valid since January 1.

The rebellious Congress, which includes a coalition of all political parties, is equally incapable of legitimising its position, and the barbarous arbitrament of the sword seems alone capable of solving the question at issue. The country, meanwhile, has to undergo in double form the miseries of civil war, for while its ports are blockaded and bombarded by the Congressional party from the sea, the inland districts are ravaged by the Presidential troops, who sack and burn the houses of their wealthier opponents. The excesses of martial law on the one hand, and of unlicensed anarchy on the other, have produced a reign of terror in which all business is suspended, and the operations of commerce and agriculture are abandoned alike. Some of the banks in Valparaiso have been closed by Presidential decree, and such pressure was put on the others by the threat of withdrawing the Government deposits, and thus reducing them to temporary insolvency, that they consented as an alternative to its issue of paper money to a large amount. Both parties seem equally determined, and as neither can strike an effectual blow at the



other, it is impossible to foresee the eventual result of the struggle.

Whatever it may be, Chile will have lost during its continuance the fruits of fifty years of progress, and her people will have learned the truth of the adage in which their neighbours of Mexico sum up the teaching of many such experiences, that "a bad government is better than a good revolution."

E. M. CLERKE.

---

ART. VI.—THE HOMAGE OF CHRIST THE KING.

(1 COR. xv. 28.)

TOWARDS the end of the year 52 of our Era a solitary Eastern traveller quitted Athens and turned his steps towards Corinth. He journeyed with a great purpose, for he had in mind no less an aim than to upturn the established religion of Greece, and on its ruins to erect the stately edifice of a new and antagonistic faith. And what were the qualities, endowments, and advantages that equipped him for so colossal an enterprise? Corinth was at this time the capital of the southern division of Achaia, that is, of the whole of Greece south of Thessaly. She was the rallying-point of a large floating cosmopolitan population, the commercial centre to which for the exchange of wares merchants converged from East and West, from the Orontes to the Tiber. Such was the city of "seagirt Corinth." The inhabitants were remarkable for their wealth, their culture, their literary tastes, their appreciation of intellectual talent, and, above all, for that luxury and licentiousness which had been raised to the rank of a religious rite, and which had turned the name of Corinthian into a byword for a voluptuary and a wanton.\* What then were the credentials with which our traveller came furnished for an undertaking so impracticable? To all appearance they were insignificant indeed. He was a poor man, by trade a tentmaker. He was a foreigner, a "barbarian," one of a despised race—a Jew. The language of these refined and fastidious citizens of the "Star of Greece" was to him an acquired tongue, which he spoke rudely, and wrote ruggedly. These Greeks were proud of their orators, poets, and philosophers. This wandering stranger made light of eloquence, and professed

---

\* Cf. *κορωνιάζεσθαι* and *κορωνία κόρη*.

to preach without "loftiness of speech," or "the persuasive words of human wisdom." He girded at secular knowledge and learning, openly proclaimed "the wisdom of this world foolishness," and counselled his hearers, "if any man among you thinketh himself wise, let him turn fool that he may become wise." And so little sympathy had he with wantonness, and effeminacy, and bodily indulgence, that his mission was to proclaim in trumpet-tones to these sensuous devotees of Aphrodite that man's body is the temple of God, and "if any man violate this temple, him shall God destroy;" with terrible directness he delivered the hard message of the New Law, that the Christian must "cleanse himself from all defilement of the flesh," for "neither fornicators, nor adulterers, nor the wanton shall possess the Kingdom of God."

Such was the man who had come to combat the intellectual arrogance, the false pride, the debased philosophy, the deep-rooted sensuality of a powerful, a wealthy, a cultured, and a subtle-minded people! Judged from a human standpoint, what hope of success in his enterprise awaited this foreigner, this tent-maker, this enthusiast and seer of visions, this "babbler and setter forth of strange gods," at whom the Stoic and Epicurean philosophers had pointed a mocking finger when he stood in the midst of them in the Areopagus at Athens? From the point of view of what he himself emphatically called "the world," what were the chances in his favour as the traveller journeyed down the Isthmus by the "double-sea," and in the distance there rose into sight the high summit of the Acrocorinthus?

St. Paul entered Corinth. In eighteen months he had built up the solid edifice of a large, flourishing, and important Christian Church, the members of which were isolated from their neighbours by strangeness of religion, of manners, of dress, and by the possession of unknown and startling supernatural gifts. After eighteen months he quitted the city, and when he sailed for Ephesus there escorted him to the port of Kenkry a great concourse of every rank and class, who addressed him as "Father," regulated their lives in accordance with his precepts, and parted from him with expressions of sorrow and regret prompted by an affection and veneration uncommon in the Grecian character.

Five years after St. Paul's departure, three envoys from his Corinthian converts waited on the apostle at Ephesus. They were the bearers of an epistle begging for a solution of several questions on matters ecclesiastical, moral, liturgical, but especially of that touching the resurrection of the dead. When St Paul preached at Athens, the Athenians "mocked when they heard of the resurrection of the dead." And now, among the Corinthian Christians, with their strong taste for intellectual

speculation, with their love of logical subtleties and rhetorical affectations to which the Sophists had accustomed them, with their exaggeration of purely philosophical difficulties, the same question had been discussed, and misunderstood, and cavilled at, and called in question, until some had fallen into doubt, and asked, "How do the dead rise again, or with what manner of body shall they come?" so that the apostle was driven to complain, "How do some among you say that there is no resurrection of the dead?" It was to the answering of this question that St. Paul addressed himself in the fifteenth chapter of his "First Epistle to the Corinthians."

In that chapter the apostle describes the past resurrection of Christ, the future resurrection of mankind, the subjugation of Christ's enemies, and the destruction of Death; and concludes this part of his argument with the statement that "when all things shall be subdued unto Him, then the Son Himself also *shall be subject* unto Him that put all things under Him, that God may be all in all" (ver. 28). This difficult verse, which has furnished a battle-ground for contending commentators of every age and creed, enunciates a doctrine of which there is no exact parallel elsewhere in the Scriptures. What, it is asked, is this subjection of the Son? Is it an act or a state? Is it a subjection of His divinity or His humanity? How can He be subject in His divinity? And in His humanity was He not ever subject? Does this subjection imply aught of diminution or humiliation? These are questions that call for answers, and have met with answers as varied as the varied bias of the commentators who put them forward. Even the Fathers were puzzled, and have left us by no means concordant interpretations.

The recent publication of Father Cornely's exhaustive work on this Epistle\* has put it in our power to examine this doctrine anew, in the light of the most modern criticism, based upon a thoroughly sound dogmatic theology. The learned Jesuit, it is needless to say, shows a masterly grasp of the question, speaks with no faltering voice, propounds a clear and definite solution, and like a consummate pilot steers his course clear of the rocks and shoals which beset his path to the right hand and to the left.

Through eighty closely printed large octavo pages he discusses the resurrection of the dead with a fulness, a lucidity, a wealth of illustration, a firmness of dogmatic touch, combined with a wide and deep acquaintance with patristic theology that, together with his broad liberality, make Father Cornely—especially to

---

\* "Commentarius in S. Pauli priorem epistolam ad Corinthios," auctore Rudolpho Cornely, S.J. Parisiis: P. Lethielleux.

students accustomed to use non-Catholic commentators—a most satisfactory and trustworthy guide. If there is a complaint to make, it is that he is perhaps a little *too sober-minded* in his judgments, and criticises in a somewhat too matter-of-fact spirit the imaginative, highly wrought, and dramatic soarings of the great mind whose writings he is here expounding. His conclusion on the question of Christ's subjection would seem to be a case in point. Father Cornely sums up his consideration of that question thus :

I am far from agreeing with that not insignificant school who, while keeping the proper meaning of the word "subjection," explain it as identical in meaning with "manifestation of subjection." Doubtless the Son—that is, the Incarnate Word—is, even now, subject to the Father; but on delivering up the kingdom He will become subject *in a new manner*; at present He is subject as King of the Church Militant, then He will be subject as Head and King of the Church Triumphant, &c. (pp. 480-1).

But to the present writer the view adopted by St. Thomas\* seems far more plausible, viz., that Christ, after the general resurrection, will *not* be subject "in a new manner," but that the subjection of which St. Paul speaks implies neither more nor less than a "manifestation of subjection," that is, a fresh declaration, profession, and acknowledgment—a re-affirmation and renewed assertion—of a full, entire, perfect, and complete subjection which had existed on the part of Christ from the first instant of His Incarnation, when the Holy Spirit came upon Mary, and the power of the Most High overshadowed her. This renewal of subjection implies no abdication or deposition of Christ the King, but rather the assurance of an everlasting reign. For our Lord is that "certain nobleman who went into a far country to receive for himself a kingdom and to return. . . . And it came to pass that he returned, having received the kingdom" (Luke xix. 12, 15). As in the ages of feudal service the liegeman was wont at intervals to do homage for his seignory to the over-lord in renewed recognition of a subjection and dependence that already existed and were not thereby increased, in like manner will the Vassal-King—the man Christ Jesus—do homage, render service, and show fealty for His everlasting kingdom to that Suzerain and Lord Paramount who appointed Him ruler of all His possessions (Ps. civ. 21). This homage of Christ the King is not a new, but the new recognition of an old subjection.

\* In b. l. "Christ is, even now, as man, subject to God, but then His subjection will be made *more manifest*." This opinion was defended by Dionysius the Carthusian, Haymon of Halberstadt, and later, by Estius, Drach, and many others.

In the first part of the chapter under discussion (ver. 1-34), St. Paul confronts those who had denied the future resurrection of the dead with three arguments, of which the second and third are of lesser importance, but the first is primary and concerns us here. In the two minor arguments (ver. 29-34) the apostle shows that the conduct of himself in particular and of Christians in general is inexplicable, if this fundamental doctrine is denied. His first and cardinal argument (ver. 1-28) is drawn from the intimate connection subsisting between the accomplished resurrection of Christ and the future resurrection of mankind. This argument he expresses in the form of a syllogism, with—as is usual with him—a suppressed conclusion, thus: "Christ has risen from the dead" (ver. 1-20); "but the resurrection of Christ implies the resurrection of those that are Christ's" (ver. 21-28): "therefore all men will rise again." The major premiss he proves from the testimonies of eye-witnesses to whom the risen Christ had appeared (ver. 1-11), and from the absurd consequences springing from the denial of this resurrection (ver. 12-20). The minor premiss, in which alone we are here immediately interested, calls for a somewhat more detailed consideration.

Verse 20: "But now Christ is risen from the dead, the first-fruits of them that sleep." St. Paul, after leading his readers through a nightmare of horrors spread out before the view of those who deny the resurrection of Christ, after painting the hopelessness and despair awaiting them, bursts forth abruptly with a jubilant cry of deliverance "But now Christ is risen," is risen, moreover, not as a mere individual and disconnected unit, but as the head of that body whereof we are the members, as the firstborn of that family whereof we are the brethren, as the first-fruits of that harvest whereof we are the abundant sheaves. "The first-fruits of the sleepers." To the dramatic eye of the apostle the huge earth is one great cemetery, *κοιμητήριον*, or sleeping-place, in which the seed lies dormant until the spring-time of resurrection starts it into active life—one vast field, or God's acre, wherein the bodies of the dead are sown to yield a rich produce for the service of the Lord. Already the crop is ripening to the harvest. Already an earnest of it has been got in, a firstling offered to the Lord. Already Christ, the first ripe sheaf and richest of the harvest, has been gathered in, the rest of the crop will be housed in due season.

Verse 21: "For by a man death, and by a man the resurrection of the dead." As a man was the bringer-in of death, so it is fitting that a man should be the bringer-in of resurrection. By a man human nature had been blighted, debased, despoiled of its preternatural endowment of immortality; by a man it was

fitting that human nature should recover its health, dignity, and gift of immortality. Man had done the damage, and begotten death; it was fitting that man should repair the damage, and destroy death.

Verse 22: "And as in Adam all die, so also in Christ all shall be made alive."\* What is the relation of this to the preceding verse? The sense of both verses hinges on the prepositions "by man" (*διὰ*) and "in Adam" (*ἐν*). To consider first the introduction of death. Each preposition expresses a cause of death, *διὰ* the radical, remote, mediate cause, *ἐν*, the derived, proximate, immediate cause; *διὰ* refers to the death-bearing *act*, *ἐν* to the death-bearing *state*, the result of that act; *διὰ* implies the "peccatum originans," the actual sin perpetrated when, eating of the forbidden fruit, man incurred the doom, "In what day soever thou shalt eat of it, thou shalt die the death," *ἐν* implies the "peccatum originatum," the habitual sin which contaminated the sinner's soul after the transient act had passed away. The actual sin of Adam, as actual, and consequently transient, was not, and could not be, propagated in his posterity. But the habitual sin, the *habit* of sin which that act caused, the guilt with which it infected the soul, the aversion of the will from its supernatural end, God—this could be and is transmitted to Adam's posterity. Sinners are we all, infants included. "Death passed upon all, because all have sinned" (Rom. v. 12). But, it may be asked, where in transmitted original sin is that element of voluntariness, that *free* defect of the will, which is a necessary factor of all sin? How can there be a free defect of will in an unbaptised infant whose soul original sin is said to blot and mar? The answer to this fundamental difficulty is supplied by St. Paul in this verse. It is this: the actual sin of Adam is *imputed* to all; his was a sin, not of the individual only, but of the whole nature, and stains that nature wherever found. The will of the race was bound up in a moral solidarity with the will of the head of the race, so that the sin of the head became the sin of the whole body. The race *fell by* Adam's actual sin; the race *sins in* the habitual sin of Adam's will, which is morally its own.

And as with Adam, so with Christ; as with death, so with resurrection. St. Paul in two pregnant verses has expressed a colossal antithesis. By act Adam sinned, by act Christ atoned; in the will of Adam, the natural head, the whole body fell; in the will of Christ, the spiritual head, the whole body rose again. Here is Christ's indefeasible title to His kingship and His kingdom—a kingship and a kingdom to endure so long as humanity remains

---

\* Read *for* instead of *and* ὥστε γάρ.



liberated from the thralldom of death—that is, for ever. Christ will be for ever King of “all who shall be made alive.”

This leads to the further inquiry as to the extension of this term *all*. That St. Paul elsewhere taught the resurrection of all bodies is abundantly clear from his pleadings before the Governor Felix—“having hope in God . . . that there shall be resurrection of the just and the unjust.” But whether this doctrine is, or is not, taught in this verse is a contested question. Ambrose is the choragus of the Inclusionists, Œcumenius of the Exclusionists. The latter point out that St. Paul sometimes, at least, speaks exclusively of the resurrection of the elect (*e.g.*, Phil. iii. 11); that Christ cannot be called the “first-fruits” of the reprobate;\* that the resurrection of the head implies only the resurrection of the members; that in the latter part of the chapter the apostle explicitly confines his remarks to glorified bodies; and that the verb “shall be made alive”—ζωοποιηθήσονται—is applicable only to a glorious resurrection. This reasoning is, however, far from conclusive. The Ambrosianists retort with the unanswerable argument that Christ can only “destroy the last enemy, death” (ver. 26), by wresting from him all his spoils, the bodies not less of the reprobate than of the elect.

The truth seems to lie in the mean. St. Paul here refers to the elect alone explicitly, to all implicitly. By a euphemism gratifying to the Greek character he avoids mention of a distasteful subject.† He writes as if his hearers had a personal interest only in the elect. But his thought is couched in language which affords a legitimate and conclusive argument for the resurrection of all, just and unjust. Christ is head of the whole family. As far as in Him lies, He is the “first-fruits” of the whole race; and if, in the field of God’s husbandry, tares be found, not Christ but the enemy hath sown them. Christ has won actual resurrection for the body in its preternatural life of glory or of suffering. He has won a *destiny* to resurrection for the soul in its supernatural life of grace and glory. All bodies *must* rise again, in the next world; all souls *will* rise again, in this world (from the merely natural to the supernatural life) if they apply to themselves the merits of Christ’s passion. The preternatural resurrection of the body is unconditioned; the supernatural resurrection of the soul requires, as a condition, the co-operation of the soul.

Verse 23: “But every one in his own order: the first-fruits Christ, then they that are of Christ, who have believed in His coming.” The better Greek texts have the preferable reading,

\* Father Cornely even thinks such a view “foolish”—“nisi Christum reprobatorum quoque resurgentium primitias *stulte* velimus,” &c., p. 472.

† Compare the Greek habit of calling the Erinyes, or Furies, by the less ominous name of Eumenides, or the Gracious Ones.

they that are Christ's, at His coming (οἱ τοῦ Χριστοῦ ἐν τῇ παρουσίᾳ αὐτοῦ). This Advent defines the time of the General Resurrection. The verse is probably an answer to the Corinthian contention that the resurrection was only a spiritual resurrection, and already past (cf. 2 Tim. ii. 18), a false impression based on the Platonic doctrine that matter, ὕλη, is the source of all evil, physical and moral; that the material body is the principle of sin, and that, as such, its resurrection is a consummation devoutly not to be wished.

The word translated *order*—τάγμα—does not occur elsewhere in the New Testament. The usual scriptural word for *order* is τάξις. The former means a *troop* or *company*, in the military sense. Clemens Romanus (1 Cor. 37) makes each officer to be a *troop* in himself. The word implies a precedence of time and dignity. First Christ, a legion in Himself—first in dignity, first in time; as the “first-fruits” precede the crop in time, and surpass it in excellence, so must the resurrection of Christ precede that of His elect. “And He is before all . . . and He is the Head of the body, the Church, who is the beginning, the firstborn from the dead, that in all things He may hold the primacy” (Coloss. i. 17). There is here no explicit reference to the reprobate. This, it may plausibly be argued, is another example of that employment of euphemism noticed above; by a sort of aposiopesis more eloquent than many words, St. Paul commences the enumeration of the “troops” only to stop short when he reaches those of the damned: “First Christ, secondly (ἔπειτα, deinde) they that are Christ's, —” by an ominous silence the writer leaves the “thirdly, the reprobate,” to be supplied by the imagination of the reader. Among the ranks of the risen elect, there is a precedence, not of time, but of dignity only. Not of time, for “the trumpet shall sound and the dead shall rise in a moment, in the twinkling of an eye” (ver. 52); but of dignity—for “there is one glory of the sun, and another glory of the moon, and another glory of the stars; for one star differeth from another star in glory, so also is the resurrection of the dead” (ver. 41, 42).

What, it may be asked, was the vision that filled the mind's eye of the inspired seer under this metaphor of τάγμα or *troop*? The apostle appears to have pictured the elect starting, at the trumpet-sound, instantaneously from earth and sea—“from the four winds, from the farthest parts of the heavens to the utmost bounds of them”—ranged in their legions of doctors and confessors, and virgins and martyrs—to marshal themselves on the right side of Christ the King when He shall proceed to that Judgment whereat the hostile powers will be enchained (ver. 24),

and the arch enemy, Death, destroyed (ver. 26). Similar was the vision of John in the Apocalypse (xix.) when—"I saw heaven opened, and behold a white horse; and he that sat upon him was called Faithful and True, . . . who doth judge and make war . . . and His name was the Word of God. *And the armies that were in heaven followed Him.* . . . And He hath on his thigh a name written, King of kings and Lord of lords."

Verse 24: "Afterwards the end, when He shall have delivered up the kingdom to God and the Father, when He shall have brought to nought all principality, and power, and virtue." The preferable reading is *ὅταν παραδιδῷ*, when He is (or shall be) delivering up; that is, the "end" and "the delivering up" are to be simultaneous. What this *end* or *consummation*\* (*τέλος*) is, is defined in ver. 28—"that God may be all in all." All that follows after *end*, to the close of ver. 28, is explanatory of this end. This *end*, inasmuch as it coincides with the "delivering up," cannot mean, as some have maintained, the resurrection of the reprobate, since the "delivering up" follows the destruction of death, which follows the resurrection of the reprobate. Death is only destroyed by the resurrection of all. The order is (1) resurrection of all; (2) destruction of death; (3) delivering up of kingdom. It is absurd, too, to limit the meaning of *τέλος* to *end of the world*, for while the *τέλος* and delivering up are contemporaneous, the end of the world must precede both.†

What then was this *τέλος* in the mind of St. Paul? Explicitly it signified the accomplishment of that purpose for which we were created—the complete fulfilment of the Divine Will, "that God may be all in all." But it implied much more than this. It implied the point of time from which this complete fulfilment commences—the *terminus a quo*, or end of the world—when the powers of darkness have been abolished, and death has been destroyed, and "the first heaven and first earth have passed away, and there is no more sea." It implied the duration during which God will be all in all—*i.e.*, Eternity: "The *end*, everlasting life" (Rom. vi. 22). It implied the consummation of perfect happiness of soul and body, of the whole man, by the possession of God the Supreme Good: "Receiving the *end* of your faith . . . salvation" (1 Peter i. 9). And lastly, it implied Him who is in Himself not only the source and origin, but the end and consummation of every good, natural and super-

\* Cf. Rom. x. 4, and Bretschneider sub h. v., n. 4.

† No commentator seems to have attached a military sense to *τέλος*. Yet the word signifies, equally with *τάγμα*, a *troop* or *legion*, cf. Herodotus i. 103, or *squadron*, Thucydides i. 48.

natural—God : “ I am the Alpha and the Omega, the Beginning and the End ” (Apoc. xxi. 6). \*

“ When he delivers up the kingdom.” What is this kingdom? The expression “ the kingdom ”—absolutely—is not elsewhere used by St. Paul. It may have a triple signification : the region ruled over, “ My kingdom is not of this world ” (John xviii. 36) ; the subjects ruled over, “ He hath made us a kingdom ” (Apoc. i. 6) ; kingship or rule, “ Of His kingdom there shall be no end ” (Luke i. 33). And this rule or kingship may be based on a complex title, which in Christ is at least twofold. He is king by title of Creation, “ God hath spoken by His Son . . . by whom also He made the worlds ” (Heb. i. 2), in virtue of which He rules over all creatures—angels, devils, reprobate and elect. He is king, too, by title of Redemption, “ Who translated us into the kingdom of the Son . . . in whom we have our redemption ” (Coloss. i. 13). This latter kingdom may briefly and conveniently be regarded under a double aspect—as the kingdom of grace and of glory, the former a preparation for the latter ; the former in this world, the latter in the next.

“ After having brought to nought (abolished) all principality and power and virtue.” These are understood by the Greek Fathers, by Hilarius, &c., and by most modern commentators, to be demons, denominated by the titles of the Angelic orders, to which they once belonged. But the terms also imply sin, death, and the reprobate—the instruments by which the devils carry on their work. This is manifest from ver. 55, 56, “ Death is swallowed up in victory. O death, where is thy victory? O death, where is thy sting? The sting of death is sin.”

Verse 25 : For He must reign, “ Until He hath put all His enemies under His feet ” (Ps. cix. 1) : ἀρχὴς οὗ ἂν θῇ, donec posuerit, *until He shall have put*. St. Paul proves from the Psalm what he had asserted in the preceding verse, that the delivering up of the kingdom will be preceded by the subjugation of the enemy—God, in the Old Law had foretold it.

Verse 26 : “ And the enemy Death shall be destroyed last,” “ For He (God) hath put all things under His (Christ's) feet ” (Ps. viii. 8). The proof here adduced turns on the one word *all* (ἅ), as in the preceding verse it turned on the one word *until* (ἄχρις). All creatures are to be made subject to Christ,

---

\* It deserves notice that the apostle has, in this chapter, assigned all the causes of the Resurrection. The *exemplar* cause, Christ, the first-fruits (ver. 20), (Cf. “ Jesus said to her, I am the Resurrection and the Life ” John xi. 25). The *meritorious* cause, Christ by His death (21). The *efficient* cause, God (28). The *formal* cause, the life infused by Christ, the ζωὴ contained in ζωοποιθοῦνται (22). The *material* cause, the glorified bodies (36). The *final* cause, the τέλος, that God may be all in all (28).

and therefore Death is to be made subject. Death is here personified, and numbered among the rest of Christ's foes—Death, the royal tyrant, begotten of a royal sire, Sin. ("Death reigned," Rom. v. 17; "Sin reigned in Death," Rom. v. 21.) Death is the implacable enemy of Christ's kingdom, because as avenger of its parent, sin—sin, the offspring of Satan's hatred of God—it has dominated the whole race of man, having spared not to lay its icy grasp even on the sacred person of Christ Himself; and that, too, contrary to the will of God, who, in the beginning made man, soul and body, imperishable and immortal. Death is the foe last overcome, because it retains its hold on its spoils—the bodies of the elect—even after their souls have been translated into Paradise beyond the reach of the other enemies, the devils and sin. Christ had undermined the empire of Death by His own glorious resurrection; but this was not enough. This tyrant, with his imperious mandate, "Dust thou art, and unto dust thou shalt return," must be "abolished," root and branch, he must be destroyed, for in Christ's everlasting kingdom the penalty of sin can no more have place than can sin itself. Death, indeed, will be destroyed by the restoration of that life which death had reft away—by the resurrection of the body; but to eradicate from the Corinthian mind all notion of the possibility of a second death of the body, the apostle personifies death, paints it as a dread, unsubstantial, shadowy despot, gives that "a shape that shape hath none," pictures it as a "grim and grisly" spectre, whose head the likeness of a kingly crown has on, and then dooms the goblin to utter, irreparable, everlasting destruction.\*

Verses 27, 28: "When He (Christ) shall have said, 'All things have been put in subjection'—evidently excepting Him (the Father) who subjected all things unto Him (Christ)—when (I say) all things shall have been made subject to Him (Christ), then the Son Himself shall be subjected to Him (the Father) that did subject all things unto Him (Christ), that God may be all in all."

Here we come to the last great masterpiece in the gallery through which St. Paul has been conducting us. He has depicted the risen Christ as the first-fruits. He has bodied forth a vast

---

\* Cf. Milton's "Paradise Lost," 2, 666; and Spenser's "Faerie Queen," 7, 17, 46:—

But after all came Life and lastly Death,  
Death with most grim and grisly visage seen:  
Yet is he nought but parting of the breath,  
Ne aught to see, but like a shade to ween,  
Unbodied, unsouled, unheard, unseen.

God's acre, sown with seed of the sleeping dead. He has portrayed the legions of the risen marching under their captain to deal a final and crushing blow at the tyrants—Satan, Sin, Death. Then for our study, he presented three other pieces—the abolition of the hostile Powers, the death of Death,\* and the conqueror with His foot on the prostrate foe. And now that we have reached this crowning scene, the apostle's language mirrors the intensity of the thought and feeling struggling for expression in his heart and brain. St. Paul's style is always rugged, always abrupt, always inadequate to convey his pregnant thought. But, in these verses, the words have burst forth as the rough boulders in an avalanche plunge pell-mell down a mountain side, jostling and hustling in their headlong, spasmodic course, rebounding a moment from some immovable obstacle, then speeding forward again with precipitant rush—to lie at last in the valley a jumbled, tumbled confusion, and yet withal admirably expressive of the force that hurled them down. Symmetry, lucidity, grammatical construction, there is none, as the pent-up conceptions, striving for utterance, crack the language in its effort to convey them. Yet his words fill the reader with the intense conviction that the writer *saw* what he described, that, as he sat with the Corinthian scroll unrolled before him, there passed across his mental gaze a panorama of gorgeous scenes hardly to be outdone in vividness by the reality itself. St. Paul is emphatically the seer. "His words are not dead words, they are living creatures, and have hands and feet." His language is the offspring of a mind in which thought has fired the brain. His shipwreck of grammar and construction is the outpouring of the most impassioned eloquence, more expressive in its muscular collectedness than the balanced periods of a polished and fastidious orator. In eight verses he has painted, with the rapid strokes and large touches of a master-hand, the spiritual history of heaven and earth from its opening to its close.

It is curious and instructive to note the many conflicting interpretations of this last verse. The Sabellians and Marcionites† considered the future subjection of Christ to God to imply the merging afresh of the Son in the Father. Others, referred to by Augustine,‡ held that the subject involved the change of the Sacred Humanity into the Divine substance. The Arians declared that the verse plainly declared the inferiority, in every respect, of the Son to the Father. Akin to the last opinion is that propounded by certain Protestants, of whom

---

\* "O Death, I will be thy death! O see," 13, 14.

† Cf. Ambrose "De Fide," 5, 7.

‡ "Lib. contra Sermonem Arianum," c. 37.



Godet\* may fairly be taken as a representative: "Subordination was therefore, according to St. Paul, in harmony with the essential relation of the Son to the Father in his *divine* and human existence. If, consequently, he is called to reign, by exercising divine sovereignty within the universe, it can only be for a time, with a view to the obtaining of a particular result. This end gained, He will return to his normal position—subordination relatively to God the Father. Such, as it seems to me, is the true thought of the apostle. How did he understand the state of the Son after this act of voluntary subjection? In his view this act of subjection could be no loss to the Son. It is not He who descends from the divine throne; it is his subjects who are raised to it along with Him: 'To him that overcometh, will I grant to sit on my throne, as I overcame.' Even on the divine throne Christ is only 'as an elder brother in the midst of many brethren.' 'Heirs of God and joint heirs with Christ,' says S. Paul in the same sense, *i.e.*, sharing with Him the divine inheritance, the possession of God Himself. He is, therefore, no longer a king surrounded by His subjects, but a brother, who in relation to His brethren keeps only the advantage of His eternal priority." There is little in this passage with which the orthodox can agree. The Son is not subordinate in His divine nature; the exercise of divine sovereignty in His divine nature is not for a time only; His exercise of sovereignty in His human nature is not divine. Nor will He return to subordination; not in His human nature, because in that He was never aught but subordinate; not in His divine nature, because in that He cannot be subordinate. To say that Christ will not be a King for ever is to forget that text of St. Paul to the Ephesians (i. 20): 'The Father of glory . . . raising Him (Christ) up from the dead, and setting Him on His right hand in the heavenly places, above all principality, and power, and virtue, and dominion, and every name that is named, *not only in this world, but also in that which is to come.* And He hath subjected *all* things under His feet, and hath made Him head over all the Church.'

It is interesting also to consider the standpoint of the late Dean Stanley: † "Even if in this present world a distinction must be allowed between God, the invisible Eternal Father, and Christ, the Lord and Ruler of man, St. Paul points our thoughts to a time when the distinction will cease, when the reign of all intermediate objects, even of Christ Himself, shall cease, and God will fill all the universe, and be Himself present in the hearts and minds of all." How much is there in this passage that is not

---

\* "Com. on First Ep. to Cor.," ii. p. 371. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark.  
† "The Ep. of S. Paul to Cor.," p. 316.

wrong or inaccurate? It is wrong to say there is no distinction between the Father and Christ, quite apart from the exigencies of "the present world;" it is wrong to say that this distinction will ever cease; it is wrong to say that Christ's reign will ever cease; and it is inaccurate to imply that God is not always and of necessity "present in the minds and hearts of all"—by His essence, by His presence, by His power—since "in Him we live and move and are."

Among Catholic commentators, several of the Greek Fathers, of whom St. Chrysostom is the corypheus, understand the subjection of Christ to be in His divine personality, in that the Father is *principium sine principio*, the Son *principium a principio*—a subjection, however, that is purely metaphorical, implying merely "a marvellous unanimity of Father and Son, by which the latter manifests Himself to be indeed God, but God of God." Again, not a few of the Fathers understand here by "Son" the mystical body of Christ, or even the individual members of that body taken distributively.\* Moreover, very many of the Latin Fathers by "Son" understand the Word as subsisting in the human nature, for "inasmuch as the Word is God, His kingship is not only uninterrupted and without end, it is also without beginning. The Word *began* to reign only in so far as 'It was made Flesh.'"† But these two last explanations are but inadequate statements and different aspects of one and the same fact. The "Son" is indeed Christ in His humanity, but Christ as Head of the mystical body of the Church. In this capacity alone will there be, after the general resurrection, any occasion for subjection on the part of Jesus. Surely the explanation is plain enough? When a feudal lord rendered fealty for his barony he answered for the loyalty of both himself and his vassals. So Christ's act of subjection will be made, not for Himself only, but also for the members of the body of which He is the Head. "The Son Himself" explicitly signifies Christ the Head, it implicitly connotes also the Body to which that Head belongs.

With this brief indication of the many divergent views taken of this difficult verse, it is here maintained that this subjection

\* *E.g.*, Origen, Greg. Naz., Greg. Nyss., Cyr. Alex., Theodoret, Hilarius, Ambrose, Jerome, &c.; cf. Cornely, p. 480. De Wette stigmatises this view as "an empty subterfuge" (*eine leere Ausflucht*), but he would have done well to have first read the writers he condemns. Names weighty as these are not to be waived aside with such scant courtesy. Offhand rejection of this sort stamps certain latter-day commentators, who forget that, beyond the elucidation of grammatical and linguistic difficulties, they have added little or nothing to the exegesis of the Fathers. But these modern critics transcribe so diligently one from another that they have forgotten the original obligation—or were never aware of it.

† Augustine De Trin., i. 8, 10; qu. 6, 9; inter. qu. 83, &c.

of Jesus is no renunciation of power, or diminution of dignity, but is nothing more than an act of homage to God, performed by Christ in His human nature, by which on the introduction, after the Judgment, of the Church triumphant into heaven, the God Man will manifest anew that subordination which had existed in Him in unblemished perfection from the first instant of His conception, and which will continue to exist in that perfection for all eternity.

Christ, it is needless to point out, may be considered in a twofold manner, as God and as Man, in His divine and in His human nature.\* Assuredly the subjection of which S. Paul speaks is not that of His divine nature. Christ, in his divine nature, is God; how then can He, in that nature, be subject, and hence inferior, to God? For the end and purpose of this subjection is to deliver the kingdom *to God and the Father*, "that God may be all in all." Christ, as God, was the artificer of the universe: "All things were made by Him" (John i. 3). "All things were created by Him" (Coloss. i. 16). This title to kingship, based on creation, as it was without beginning, so it will be without end—sempiternal. For whatever power is wielded by the Father, that same power is wielded also by the Son; "All things whatever the Father hath are mine" (John xvi. 15), and that by the virtue of the eternal procession of the Son from the Father, with diversity indeed of personality, but in absolute identity of nature. Whatever is in God is God. Hence to subtract power from Christ as God is to subtract God from God, and thus to destroy the Godhead. If, then, it is Christ, as God, who is conceived to deliver up the kingdom to the Father, such delivery can in no sense be a subjection; otherwise we are reduced to this absurdity, that the Father became subject to the Son when He delivered up all things to the Son: "All things are delivered unto Me of My Father" (Matt. ii. 27).

This subjection therefore must be the subordination of Christ in His human nature. We ask, then, is that subjection to be voluntary or involuntary? Not the latter, certainly. It is inconceivable that the human nature of Christ, which is under the rule and guidance of its divine Personality—the Word—could ever be anything but perfectly subject. Such hypothetical insubordination—the imperfection of imperfect subjection—would be laid to the account of the Word Itself, which controls the created nature to which It is hypostatically united. More than this. Is not the New Testament studded with declarations of Christ's

\* Dr. Godet, l.c. p. 368-9, calls this distinction in question. Such a lamentable want of acquaintance with the theology of the Hypostatic Union is prevalent among Protestant writers, and leads to much error. The recent controversy on the knowledge of Christ as man is a case in point.

absolute subjection to the Godhead? The very keynote of the relations of our Lord's human to His divine will is struck in that refrain of the Gospels, "Not My will, but Thine, O God, be done."

Christ's subjection, therefore, when the end and consummation comes, will be voluntary. And, as such, it will be either a new subjection, or the old subjection continued, reaffirmed, and manifested anew. Now, a new subjection it cannot be. A new subjection would imply the shortcoming above mentioned, that Christ's subordination in the past had been defective, incomplete, imperfect—leaving room for amendment. Yet how could His subjection to God be, in any way, deficient, who, even to Mary His mother and to Joseph His foster-father, had owned an entire and willing submission?—"And he went down with them and came to Nazareth, and was subject unto them" (Luke ii. 51). There could be no shadow of independence of God in Him whose one object and purpose was to carry out the will of God; whose very meat was to do the will of Him that sent Him (John iv. 34); "For I came down from heaven, not to do Mine own will, but the will of Him that sent Me" (John vi. 38), whose command to the world was that all men should do, not His, but the Father's will: "Not every one that saith Lord, Lord, shall enter into the kingdom of Heaven, but he that doeth the will of My Father" (Matt. viii. 21). So mindful ever was Jesus of the dependence of the creature on the Creator that when a certain ruler addressed Him as "Good Master," our Lord seemingly rebuked him, "Why callest thou Me good? None is good, save One, that is, God" (Luke xviii. 19). Christ, then, in His humanity, was from the beginning perfectly subject to God, with a perfection that admitted of no spot or blemish.

But, it is argued, this subjection, of which the apostle speaks lies in no insubordination or imperfect submission of the will, but in the delivering up to God of the kingdom (v. 24) over which Christ had ruled—in the resignation of regal power. This contention is, however, as thus stated, delusive. For, is this resignation an abdication or a deposition? Not a deposition—not an unwilling surrender—as has just been shown; nor yet a voluntary abdication. For will this abdication be of the whole kingdom or only of part? That Christ, as man, will not wholly lay aside the title of King is beyond question. As the Nicene Creed has it, "Of His kingdom there shall be no end"—of the kingdom of Christ as man, for the Creed is treating of God who became man, who was crucified, who was buried, who rose again and will come to judge the living and the dead. This interpretation, too, is confirmed by Luke i. 33, from which the Creed quotes, "Behold thou shalt conceive and shalt bring forth a Son, . . . and

the Lord God shall give unto Him the throne of David His father, and He shall reign in the house of Jacob for ever, and of His kingdom there shall be no end." This eternal kingship of "the Man, Christ Jesus" is, moreover, witnessed to by St. Paul (2 Tim. ii. 12), "If we suffer, we shall also reign with Him," not in this life, but in the life to come—a reign in which Christ will sit "at the right hand of God, in the heavenly places, far above all principality, and power, and virtue, and dominion and every name that is named, not only in this world, *but also in that which is to come*" (Ephes. i. 20).

But if not wholly, will our Lord abdicate in part? Will He give up part of His kingdom, resign part of His power, surrender part of His dominion? The reasons adduced for this partial abdication are far from convincing. That drawn from v. 25, that "He must rule *until* He shall have put all His enemies under His feet"—and no longer—is based on a misconception of the force of "until." As F. Cornely points out, and as every scholar is aware, this conjunction does not always determine the action or state expressed by the preceding verb, so as to exclude the continuance of that action or state after the point marked by "until." To adduce only one text in proof: "And he (Joseph) knew her (Mary) not, *till* she brought forth her firstborn Son"; it is *de fide* that the "knowing not" is not to be limited by the point of time indicated by *till*. This is obvious, too, from the Psalm (cix. 1) on which the apostle has founded his reasoning: "The Lord said to my Lord, Sit thou at my right hand *until* I make thine enemies thy footstool." This argument, then, wounds the hand that wields it—it deposes Christ, indeed, from His throne, but it also deposes Him from the right hand of God; it not only deprives the Son of His kingdom, it also deprives the Mother of her virginity! Another proof, on which much stress is laid, is founded on the express statement of v. 24, that "the end shall come only when Christ shall have delivered up the kingdom to God and the Father." But, as before pointed out, the reading of the best MSS. is not *παράδωκε*, but *παράδιδωκε*—i.e., "Afterwards the end (consummation) when He *is delivering up*, &c." The consummation *is* this delivering up, as will presently be shown. If the argument proves anything at all, it fails like the former, in that it proves too much—it proves the delivering up of the *whole* kingdom, the *complete* abdication of Christ the King—and that is inadmissible. There lies, however, a third arrow in the quiver of the adversary, and this it still remains to receive and turn aside. This argument may be stated thus. The word *Kingdom* (v. 24) here implies, not precisely *power*

wielded by Christ, but *subjects* ruled over by Christ, and that by a peculiar kind of rule. This meaning of the word *Kingdom* in the sense of "subjects governed" is obvious from such places as Apoc. i. 6, "He made us to be a kingdom" (ἐποίησεν ἡμᾶς βασιλείαν). Now, this kingdom is, in its entirety, ruled in a twofold way, by a peaceful rule and by a military rule. The peaceful rule is that by which Christ governs the elect in heaven, over whom, undisturbed by enemies, He reigns as Head over the mystical body, "He is the Head of the body, the Church, who is the beginning, the firstborn from the dead, that in all things He might have the pre-eminence" (Coloss. i. 18). The military rule is that by which Christ defends the Church Militant on earth against her triple royal foe—Satan, Sin, Death. In this war our Lord is ὁ ἀρχηγὸς τῆς σωτηρίας (Heb. ii. 10)—the Captain of salvation—foretold in that prophecy of Isaias (lv. 4), "Behold I have given Him for a leader and commander to the people." In this war Christ will destroy the enemy. A large beginning of this destruction has, indeed, been already made: of the arch-enemy Satan, when by the death on the Cross our Saviour acquired for the Christian soldier a whole panoply of battle, clad in which he can with ease repel the onset of Satan and worst his attacking legions: "Put on the whole armour of God, that ye may be able to stand against the wiles of the devil . . . and be able to stand in the evil day—the breastplate of righteousness—the shield of faith—the helmet of salvation, and the sword of the spirit" (Ephes. vi. 11-18); of the second enemy, Sin, when Christ instituted His sacraments, and laid down the other channels for the remission of sin, so that henceforth it could be said, "Sin shall not have dominion over you, for ye are . . . under grace" (Rom. vi. 14); of the third enemy, Death, when Jesus rose again from the tomb, the first-fruits of the sleepers, "Christ being raised from the dead, dieth now no more; death hath no more dominion over Him" (Rom. vi. 9). And the destruction thus begun will be fully accomplished when, the thrones of the fallen angels being all filled by the elect, Christ shall bring to nought all principality and power and virtue, and by the destruction of the last enemy, Death, shall put all his enemies under His feet. This is the termination of the campaign, which, together with the absorption of the Church Militant into the Church Triumphant, will bring Christ's military kingdom to a close. This, it is contended, is "the delivering up of the kingdom" and the "subjection" of which St. Paul treats.

But this view, however plausible at first sight, is seen on examination to be by no means in accordance with the context. It is a view, no doubt entertained by several Fathers and modern



commentators, and is adopted by F. Cornely as his own. Quoting Father Giustiniani,\* Cornely writes :

The Son will become subject to God when all shall have been subjected to Him, on account of what was said above—viz., that He should reign until He places all His enemies under His feet ; implying thereby that that kingdom which Chrysostom calls the “*regnum conjunctionis*” or Kingdom of Conflict, will come to an end, because Christ will then no longer lead any one to faith and grace. Thus, on delivering up the kingdom, the Son is said to become subject to the Father, *i.e.*, in His character of Head of all the Saints; not, however, that He is to be subordinated to the Father otherwise than at present, but because, on laying aside the functions of King, He will no longer be dignified with the name of King.

The opinion thus expressed, Cornely supplements in the few lines before quoted :

The Son—the Incarnate Word—is in His human nature already subject to the Father, but on surrendering the kingdom He will become subject *in a new manner* ; for at present He is subject as King of the Church Militant, then He will be subject as Head and King of the Church Triumphant (pp. 479, 80).

The explanation, however, in spite of the great weight of authority in its favour, is open to many serious objections. First of all, it may be argued, not without reason, that the military empire of Christ never will end. No doubt His enemies will be subjugated, “*abolished*,” beaten down, but our Lord, in His character of military conqueror, will still continue to rule them with the sword and with measures of sternest repression. Is He not that “*Man-child who is to rule all nations with an iron rod*?” (Apoc. xii. 5). According to the words of St. John, “*Out of His mouth goeth a sharp sword, that with it He should smite the nations, and He shall rule them with a rod of iron*” (Apoc. xix. 15). And again, “*Out of His mouth went a sharp two-edged sword*,” and He said, “*I am the First, and the Last, and the Living One, and I was dead, and behold I am alive for evermore, and I have the keys of death and hell*” (Apoc. i. 16–18). Nor is this all. Grant, for argument sake, a termination of this military kingdom of Christ, what then? That termination would be due, not to any subtraction of power from Christ, but to withdrawal of subjects from under that power. This is an obvious but necessary distinction. On the conclusion of a victorious campaign, the General-in-Chief may lay down his command, or he may retain the command without having any further occasion to exercise it. On the former supposition he delivers up his

---

\* Benedictus Justinianus S.J., “*In B. Pauli Ap. Epistolas*.”

power ; on the latter, his power remains intact even though he have no longer opportunity to use it. Now, it is in the latter sense alone—as Father Cornely and those holding his view must allow—that Christ can be said at all to give up His military rule. Take another example. It has been prophesied that Christ, the great High Priest, shall be a Priest for ever,\* yet it is probable that after the general resurrection He will no longer exercise any sacerdotal function. His Priesthood will continue, the exercise of it will cease. So, too, with all other duly ordained priests of the New Law, the sacerdotal “character” will last for ever, indelible even in hell, where assuredly there will be no performance of priestly ministry. In one and the same sense, then, would Christ be Priest and Military King for all eternity ; the power itself would remain for ever, the application and exercise only of that power would be brought to an end.

The opinion, therefore, here controverted appears to be founded on a confusion of ideas, on the identification of two things different and distinct—kingship and kingdom—the right and power to rule, and the subjects ruled over. For if, by supposition, Christ should have no subjects in hell over whom to exercise military rule, none the less His Kingship would remain intact ; so that if—by an impossible hypothesis—an enemy were again to raise the head and front of rebellion, Christ, the Captain, would at once, without further delegation from the Father, be in full possession of the authority and command needed for their reduction. “All power is given to Me in heaven and on earth” (Matt. xxviii. 18). Hence, to put the best possible colour on the view here combated, it amounts in short to no more than this, that those of the elect whom Christ now governs as a Church Militant, He will—after the general resurrection—govern as a Church Triumphant. To describe this as “subjection” seems, at the very least, a violent straining of language.

Briefly, then, against the explanation put forward by Father Cornely, to wit, that Christ’s subjection will consist in the resignation of military command, and the delivering up of the military kingdom, it is answered that this military *kingdom* will subsist for ever in hell ; that, even were it otherwise, His military *kingship* would be everlasting ; that to describe this state of things as “subjection” would be simply a misnomer.

We have now seen, by a process of elimination, that our Lord’s subjection is not in His divine but His human nature ; that this subjection of His human nature is not compulsory but

---

\* Cf. Heb. vi. 20, *eis tôn aiōna, in æternum*; and cf. vii. 3. He will remain a Priest for ever, *eis tò diuvenēs*, that is, *for all eternity*, as may be proved by a comparison of x. 12, and x. 14.

voluntary ; that this voluntary subjection is not a new subjection either wholly or in part. But one conclusion therefore remains, that it is nothing more nor less than a fresh act manifesting and reaffirming that perfect submission to and complete subordination of Christ to God which have existed from the first moment when the "Word was made Flesh and dwelt among us." It now only remains to set forth, with somewhat greater detail, in what this reaffirmation consists.

Throughout the mortal life of Christ we find Him repeatedly and emphatically declaring His perfect dependence on God. This complete subordination I have already insisted on. Further, not content with *being* subordinate, He, who was meek and humble of heart, strove to *manifest* that subordination. "My doctrine is not Mine, but His that sent Me" (John vii. 16). "I do nothing of Myself; but as My Father hath taught Me I speak these things" (John viii. 28). "I seek not Mine own glory" (John viii. 50). "He that speaketh of himself seeketh his own glory, but he that seeketh the glory of Him that sent him, the same is true" (John vii. 18). "Glorify your Father who is in heaven" (Matt. v. 16). "The Son can do nothing of Himself, but what he seeth the Father do" (John v. 19). And these protestations of dependence and subjection were made by Christ for our sake, not for His own. "And *for them* do I sanctify Myself . . . that the world may believe that Thou hast sent Me" (John xvii. 19, 21). He willed to give us an example that, as He had done, so should we do likewise (John xiii. 15). He willed us to know God, "the Alpha and the Omega, the Beginning and the End, the First and the Last" (Apoc. i. 8-11); to praise God "the Father of lights, from whom cometh every good and perfect gift" (Jas. i. 17); to serve God the Creator, from whom the creature has drawn all that it is and all that it has, "in whom we live, and move, and are," through whom alone we can obtain the fulfilment of every lawful desire and attain to perfect happiness. This is that "*clara cum laude notitia*"—that clear knowledge of God, conjoined with praise—that extrinsic glory of God—to render which we were created. And yet how imperfectly God's purpose has been and is being carried out in the world! Against Him, during all time, the demons are waging war—ceaseless, ruthless, vengeful war; wicked men are, deliberately, designedly, perverting the right order established by Him; good men are continually lapsing back into sin and forgetfulness of God. The Creator has in truth ever been "all in all"—by His essence, by His presence, by His power—but the recognition and acknowledgment of this fact, and the praise owing for it and the service due on account of it, have never, since the dawn of Creation, been adequately paid, save by two of God's creatures, by the man, Christ Jesus, and "the woman," Mary the Sinless.

But with the general resurrection the realisation and right appreciation of the relation of Creator to creature will become perfect—perfect in heaven, perfect in hell. For “when the first heaven and the first earth are gone, and the sea is no more”—when the judgment is done, and the sentence executed—when Christ introduces the elect into “the new heaven and the new earth”—when the Great Liberator, with that cheering “Come, ye blessed,” triumphantly leads the captives of death captive before “the throne of God, and they see God face to face, and the Lord God enlightens them”—*then* will be Christ’s “delivering up of the kingdom.” And, at this climax in the history of the universe, while the multitudinous hosts of the elect, whom no man can number, range themselves around the Great White Throne, Christ the Vassal-King and Vassal-Lord—on His own behalf, and on that of his sub-vassals—unto God, the King of kings and Lord of lords—will make the supreme act of homage and obeisance in solemn and sublime recognition and renewed manifestation of His own subjection as a creature, and in full acknowledgment and public reaffirmation of the complete subordination of that mystical body of which He is the Head, and the elect are the members. This is the perfect restitution of right order—of all creatures unto Christ, and of Christ unto God—of the whole body unto its Head, and of that Head unto Him “the Head of Christ, who is God” (1 Cor. xi. 3). This is the delivering up of the kingdom, this the subjection of Christ—a surrender and a subjection fraught with no humiliation, but preluding glory unspeakable. For when at the name of Jesus every knee is bowed, of those that are in heaven and under the earth, and every tongue confesses that the Lord Jesus Christ is in the glory of God the Father, Jesus Himself, we may suppose, will address God in words similar, at least, to those which St. John (ch. xvii.) has preserved for us: “Father! the hour is come! Glorify Thy Son, that Thy Son may glorify Thee. As Thou hast given Him power over all flesh, that He may give eternal life to all whom Thou hast given Him. Now this is eternal life, that they may know Thee, the only true God, and Jesus Christ whom Thou hast sent. I have glorified Thee on earth; I have finished the work Thou gavest Me to do. And now glorify Thou Me, O Father, with Thyself, with the glory which I had before the world was, with Thee. I have manifested Thy Name to the men whom Thou hast given Me out of the world. . . . Now they have known that all things which Thou hast given Me are from Thee: because the words which Thou gavest Me I have given to them; and they have received them, and have known in very deed that I came out from Thee, and they have believed that Thou didst send Me. . . . And all

My things are Thine. . . . Father, I will that where I am, they also whom Thou hast given Me may be with Me, that they may see My glory which Thou hast given Me. . . . Just Father, these have known that Thou has sent Me; and I have made known Thy name to them and will make it known, that the love wherewith Thou hast loved Me may be in them, and I in them."

Thus God will be, and will be known and acknowledged to be, "all in all" in the twofold sense of that expression, as it implies the final extrinsic cause of the resurrection—or (as we may say) the resurrection looked at from the point of view of the interests of God—and the final intrinsic cause of the resurrection, that is, of the resurrection regarded from the standpoint of the interests of the risen. The former is the glory of God, the recognition by His rational creatures, conjoined with praise, of His excellence. The latter is the complete possession of God by the creature, by which the created intellect possessed of Absolute, Increate Truth, by which the created will possessed of Absolute, Increate Good, will be, with unspeakable gratification and felicity, satisfied in every rational need, desire, and inclination. This is the fulfilment of the divine will of which God spoke by the mouth of *Isaias*, "For I am God, and there is no other. I have sworn by Myself . . . every knee shall be bowed to Me" (xlv. 23-25). "*Every knee*"—but diversely. All shall bend the knee, but the elect a willing knee, the reprobate an unwilling: "All that resist Him shall be confounded." As *St. Augustine* writes: \* "The wicked servant who has scorned first to labour in his Lord's vineyard, and then to rest and feast, shall be chained for ever, and doomed to toil for ever in the penal mill, powerless any longer to thwart the Master's plans. He has acted against his Lord's intent, but he cannot frustrate it." But it is in the elect that God shall, in the fullest and truest meaning, be "all in all." As *St. Jerome* says: † "Hitherto God has indeed been all in all. But not in the full sense, not all in each. In *Solomon* He was wisdom, in *David* goodness, in *Job* patience, in *Daniel* foreknowledge, in *Peter* faith, in *Paul* zeal, in *John* virginity. But when the end comes, then He will be all in all, that is, all in each, so that every Saint will possess every perfection." In the beatific vision wherein God is seen, "not as through a glass darkly, but face to face," the elect will be filled with God's presence as a crystal in the noonday sun is filled with light, as a sponge deep in mid-ocean is filled with water; they will become like unto God when they see Him as He is (1 *John* iii. 2)—"partakers of the Divine nature" (2 *Peter* i. 4)—just as iron in the fire, without putting

---

\* "De Spir et Litt," c. 33, n. 58.

† "Epist. ad Amandum."

off the nature and character of iron, puts on the nature and character of fire, and with fire is permeated through and through. Not till God is thus "all in all" will the prophecy of the Psalm (lxxxii. 6) be fully verified, "Ye are gods, and all of you children of the Most High."

"Who shall not fear Thee, O Lord, and glorify Thy name? For Thou only art holy; for all nations shall come and worship before Thee, for Thy judgments are made manifest."

There is one aspect of the text of St. Paul we have discussed on which, however else they may differ, all commentators will certainly agree—that it contains a striking lesson for the men of this day. The world of to-day plumes itself on revolt, rebellion, uprising against authority. The homage of Christ the King teaches that the perfection of the creature lies in subjection, submission, subordination to authority.

CHARLES COUPE, S.J.

---



ART. VII.—“THE CONSTITUTION OF  
THE ATHENIANS” ASCRIBED TO ARISTOTLE.

THE first sensation which rises in the mind of one familiar with the “Politics” of Aristotle, after carefully perusing the newly discovered papyrus containing a large portion of the “Constitution of the Athenians,” is certainly one of bathos. Yet there can be no doubt we have here, although incomplete at the beginning, and frittered away into shreds and tatters at the end, what certainly passed under his name, and was by Plutarch and Herakleides, as well as by the mass of Scholiasts and compilers (among whom the name of Harpokration is the most prominent), accepted and quoted as an undoubted and genuine work of the philosopher of Stageira. Professor J. B. Mayor has already recorded his doubts on the question of genuineness, and fortified them by questions relating to special words and phrases,\* to which branch of evidence I hope to draw attention later.

But graver doubts still arise from what we do *not* find in the treatise. Having in his “Politics” touched so frequently, in various important passages, on certain prominent features in the Athenian Constitution and characteristic facts in its history, one would expect some reference in this work on the same subject at large, to his previously expressed judgments and previously† argued conclusions in that larger and more comprehensive work, to the theories of which this is related as a primary example is to a general view. Such references would be exactly in Aristotle’s manner, who six‡ times in the “Politics” refers distinctly to his “Ethics,”§ not to mention minor traces of implied retrospection. So close indeed is the connection between the “Ethics” and the “Politics,” that when we find in the latter a reference to points discussed (πρότερον), we may generally understand the former to be intended; and even when in the former a point is reserved for development (ὕστερον), it may be taken that the intention expressed was to be fulfilled in the latter. Such are the links which the philosopher establishes between his own two leading works on the two more human branches of philosophy. But the

\* See *Classical Review*, March 1891, p. 122-3.

† I say “previously,” because, as noticed below, internal evidence points to the fact of this work being very late.

‡ See “Pol.” ii. 2 (4); iii. 9 (3) and 12 (1); iv. 11 (3); vii. 13 (5) and (7); and cf. “Eth. Nikom.” v. 5 (6) and 3 (4); iii. 10 (4); vii. 13 (2); i. 7 (16); x. 6 (2); iii. 4 (4 and 5).

§ See also “Metaph.” i. 1 (17), where the “Ethics,” and “Rhet.” ii. 22, where the “Topics” are referred to.

relation of the Πολιτεῖαι, if we had them complete and genuine to the Πολιτικά is even closer yet; for they are the objective examples out of which, by induction or analogy, the conclusions of the latter treatise arise. Events and characters, previously touched upon in this latter, are reproduced with further details in this "Polity of the Athenians;" and also stand in a relation to antecedents and consequents which strengthens their pertinency to the theories of which they are the foundation. And yet, although abundant opportunities for such references present themselves, we may read this treatise, so far as now recovered, from beginning to end without suspecting that any such work as the "Politics" had ever existed. Thus the mention of ostracism in chap. 22 might have caused a reference to "Pol." iii. 13 (15, 23), 17 (7), v. 3 (3) and 8 (12); the story of Harmodius and Aristogeiton in chap. 18, to "Pol." v. 10 (15), and the history of the decline of the Areopagitic Council in political power traced in chaps. 3, 4, 8, 23, to "Pol." ii. 12 (2) (4), v. 4 (8) and 12 (2).

Of course it is, on the other side, true that the very fact of the "Politics" existing independently would enable the writer to dispense with philosophical reflections in this treatise. The discussions on principles, having a distinct sphere of their own, need not find place in what is a mere repertory of pre-existing facts. But it is not the absence of thoughtful reflections on the facts narrated—for, indeed, such reflections occur in chaps. 9, 13, 21, 26, 27—but the lack of all indices pointing to the reasonings of the "Politics," which checks our confidence in the genuineness of this treatise. For such references are so much a feature of the philosopher in his best accredited works, that the total blank left by their absence cannot but be viewed as a suspicious feature. But beyond even this, some of the remarks seem to take a different standpoint from that of the "Politics." Thus in chap. 23 we read:

So then up to this time [the Persian war] the city and the democracy together went on gradually gaining ground. But (δεῖ) after the Median [invasion] the Council of the Areopagus recovered its power, and continued to manage the state (πᾶσι); not, however, that it obtained that leading position by any formal decree, but owing to its having caused the naval combat at Salamis. For, when the generals were without resource to meet events, and gave notice of a *saure qui peût*, it found and distributed eight drachmæ per man, and [so] manned the fleet.

Now, compare with this "Pol." v. 4 (8), which I will present in Prof. Jowett's translation: \*

Governments also change into oligarchy or into a constitutional

\* "The Politics of Aristotle," vol. i. p. 452.

government (πολιτεία), because the magistrates, or some other section of the State, increase in power or renown. Thus at Athens the reputation gained by the Court of the Areopagus in the Persian war, seemed to tighten the reins of government. On the other hand, the victory at Salamis, which was gained by the common people who served in the fleet (ὁ ναυτικὸς ὄχλος), and won for the Athenians the empire of the sea, strengthened the democracy.

It will be noticed that two opposite tendencies are in this passage compared, and that with a preponderance ascribed to the latter. For such only can be the conclusion arrived at from the qualified and stinted influence ascribed to the former,\* while the latter is stated as working broadly and without reserve.† But in the treatise, as cited above, a certain check to the advance of this latter—the democracy—is clearly indicated, through the Areopagus recovering its *prestige*, and this through the opportune patriotism which brought about the very battle by which the democracy, according to the "Politics," was reinforced. In not a few cases where we expect the writer to trace the political bearings of the facts recited, we find instead of this anecdotes, interesting, no doubt, but of not even secondary value as regards the principles or political characters of the persons whom they illustrate. The unequal touch with which the work is handled is noteworthy. The Solonian and Peisistratid period, and that of "the Thirty," are treated with an ample largeness of detail, those of Kleisthenes onward to Perikles with adequate fulness, while the remaining interval appears to be mere jotting and sketching. But this may, nevertheless, be not more unlikely from Aristotle than from another. "Justice" in the fifth Book of the *Ethics* is similarly paid off with a somewhat defective outline only, while "Pleasure" in the seventh and tenth comes in for double handling. But what one might have hoped for would have been some far-sighted glimpses, if nothing more, of the actual working of the various institutions which made up the Πολιτεία.

Neither is the arrangement of materials always orderly. Thus "ostracism" is discussed as a measure first directed against the family and friends of Peisistratus. This leads to the notice of other persons against whom it was successively adopted down to Aristides, but no further; and in the midst of this is introduced a mention of the discovery of the silver mines at Maroneia (Laureium), and the use made of them by Themistokles to build a fleet, "with which they fought at Salamis against the barbarians; and Aristides, the son of Lysimachus, was ostracised in these same times." Such is the method of the narrative,

\* ἔδοξε συντονωτέραν ποιῆσαι τὴν πολιτείαν.

† τὴν δημοκρατίαν ἰσχυροτέραν ἐποίησε.

showing a discursive simplicity which may compare with Herodotus. Then follows the fact of the recall of the ostracised under the imminence of the Persian invasion, and the limits fixed for the future residence of any ostracised citizens, under the penalty of ἀριμία if transgressed. It seems to me quite impossible that Aristotle can have written this. As regards the anecdotes, many have a good relish—*e.g.*, Peisistratus, who used to go about the country, asked a digger what he got out of the ground? Who answered, "Nothing but woes and worries, and that Peisistratus [not knowing whom he was addressing] must take his tithe of them too." The "tyrant" liked the man's outspokenness, and gave him an exemption from taxes. But many of the anecdotes are known by Plutarch's excerpts, so I forbear further samples. Perhaps the most curious fact is that the leniency of Peisistratus' personal government, given as a reason why he was acceptable to both the extreme parties, exactly illustrates the rules given in the "Politics," as to how a "tyrant" ought to behave in order to secure his tenure of power. The facts exactly fit the theory, but you would never guess from the treatise that the author had ever enunciated any theory upon the subject (See chap. 16, and *cf.* "Pol." v. 11, 17-33).

But if quotations can establish identity, the identification of the present treatise with that known as Aristotle's during all the ages from the Ptolemies to Pope Gregory the First, and even later, is irrefragable. The editor says:

Ninety-one fragments are ascribed with more or less certainty to the "Constitution of the Athenians," in fifty-eight of which the work is referred to by name; of these fifty-eight, fifty-five occur in this treatise; one belongs to the beginning of the book, which is wanting; one belongs to the latter portion of it, which is imperfect; while one alone differs distinctly from a passage on the same subject occurring in the text. Of the thirty-three fragments in which the work is not named, though in most of them Aristotle is referred to as the author, twenty-three occur in [this treatise]; four come from the lost beginning; . . . four probably do not belong to this work.

Of the two remaining, one is untraceable through the mutilation at the end, while the other is either misquoted, or is from some other Aristotelian work. Thus seventy-eight of the ninety-one quotations are found in the treatise, and all the rest but two can be accounted for. Of the one quotation which diverges from the text, being on the same subject with a passage therein (No. 407, Appendix), the latter looks like a rather clumsy compendium of the former, or the former may have incorporated a marginal scholium of the latter from some other MS. But one may here notice that a large portion of the closing sections of the treatise

reads like a compendium, being hardly more than a catalogue of offices and functions. And this, indeed, is a part so barren of general interest that we may easily suppose that for most purposes an abridgment would serve. But as there are quotations from later passages which correspond exactly, it is more probable that the excerpter of No. 407, confused text with scholium.

From internal evidence the editor infers

that the treatise was written, or at least revised, at the earliest in the last seven years of Aristotle's life, and at the latest in the fifteen years after his death. We know further, from a quotation in Polybius, that Timaeus, who flourished about the middle of the third century B.C., or only two generations after Aristotle himself, referred to the *Πολιτείας*,\* and referred to it as Aristotle's.

He adds that

the evidence, internal and external, tends strongly to show that Aristotle himself was its author. Under these circumstances the burden of proof lies on those who would dispute its genuineness (Intro. xvii., xviii.).

The style bears nearly as close a resemblance to Aristotle's, but not quite, as the mask taken from a dead face does to the living man. But we find here and there a wrinkle or a wen unknown in the original. The grand defect, however, is the absence of mind in the features, and the more closely they are studied, the more this is felt. You come here and there upon a passage which lifts you up from the great "drop-down" experienced by contrast with the wide and deep discussions in the "Politics." Such an one is chap. 9, where the bearing of the popular courts on the development of the democracy is pointed out. But these flashes are rare.

We may perhaps find another such in some part of chap. 19. Much that is rather due to Aristotle than genuinely Aristotelian, is probably to be found in the former (chaps. 2-41) of the two large sections into which the entire treatise is naturally divisible. In this the successive changes, eleven in number, which led up to the constitutional final settlement known to Aristotle's own experience, are successively traced. While the latter large section might have been written by any one familiar with the existing framework of government and routine of public service, and is too baldly and dryly official to show any workings of a master-mind. Its abundance of technical terms leaves hardly any room for criticism of language. But the effect of reading half a dozen pages is *not* to leave an Aristotelian flavour on the reader's mind. It might be the "Blue-book" of a reporting commission.

\* This is not strictly correct; the reference is to Aristotle and his "History" or "Narrative." See Polyb. xii. 8 (2) (4) and 10 (4).

From the summary given in chap. 41 we know exactly what has been lost at the beginning—viz., the original constitution of the early Ionian settlers and the Thesean and Kodrid period. The commencement has the abruptness of a fragment. We find ourselves in the middle of a sentence describing the close of the revolutionary attempt of Kylon and the Alkmæonids, which, against authority hitherto received, is placed prior in time to Drako. The purification of the city by Epimenides follows; then a brief sketch of the severity of the laws for debt and the consequent depression of the labouring class leads up to an outline of the ante-Draconian constitution (chaps. 1-4). The Solonian and Peisistratid epochs, the ultra-democratic mould in which Kleisthenes recast the State, the heroic and world-famed period of Aristides and Themistokles, the curtailment of the Areopagitic Council by Ephialtes aided by the latter, the Periklean and demagogic periods, and the disasters which led on to Lysander's supremacy, the tyranny of the Thirty, with the many fluctuations which violently disturbed the last few years of Athens, still independent and nominally imperial, are all touched in outline more or less full; and the reconstitution, by the aid of Pausanias' effecting a reaction in Sparta against Lysander's dictatorship, is dealt with at considerable length. The whole of this earlier section closes with the statement of the gradual rise in pay for attendance at the Ekklesia from one to three obols, just as the fifth century B.C. ran out and the early years of the fourth had come in.

How a treatise with so little that is distinctive of Aristotle, as I believe this to be, established, in probably the generation next after his death, its character as "canonical," is indeed a curious problem. Aristotle's own great reputation and the literary energy of his pupils, were doubtless the two main factors in this result. The position of Aristotle, as the educator and, to some extent, counsellor of the conqueror of the East, whose empire yielded kingdoms to the dynasties founded by his generals, was absolutely unique in the world of letters and philosophy. His name threw a wide shadow everywhere, and bold assertion, with some grains of substantial truth involved in the asserted falsehood, had then a better chance of success than at any other period of the ancient literary world. The rival houses of the Ptolemies and the Attalids became munificent patrons of letters, and bid against each other for the possession of valuable MSS. By the time that the critical school of Alexandrian experts—the "schoolmen" of that ancient world—had formed itself, the credit of the treatise was already fully established. The chief efforts of those critics, for several generations, were directed to the poets; the title of the treatise to its Aristotelian character was *prima facie* good,



and the external evidence unimpeachable. The *πρῶτον ψεύδος* passed unchallenged into acceptance,\* and maintained its supremacy until the treatise itself passed into the catalogue of lost treasures. Then followed the long oblivion of the ages. We sit, as it were, on the further bank of Lethe and Styx, and must perforce subject to independent criteria with Rhadamanthine impartiality the character of treasure-trove exhumed. I confess, my own opinion, open, of course, to whatever may be adduced on the other side, to be that, with a good many nuggets of true metal embedded here and there, the narrative setting appears to be rhetorical solder.

I think that whoever will take a number of samples anywhere at haphazard from this treatise, will find that the Aristotelian features of style which are undeniably caught are largely mixed with, and modified by, others borrowed from the orators. And this view is confirmed by the large number of quotations found in the "Lexicon to the Ten Orators," by Harpokration. It seems unlikely that a genuine work of Aristotle would have furnished so much matter germane to his subject. But a treatise by a rhetorical member of the Peripatetic school, covering, as it did, ground constantly traversed and reviewed by those orators, would naturally furnish a quarry of very cognate material. What is known of the condition of Aristotle's remains at his death, which, like Alexander's own, was too early for the consolidation of his conquests, rather confirms than negatives the above supposition as regards the true origin of the treatise. *Pendent opera interrupta* might, it seems, be the motto selected for a large number of those remains. The same might not inaptly serve to express the undigested state in which Alexander bequeathed the material world-empire to his successors.

Most curious is the confirmatory light thrown on the above view of the genesis of this treatise by comparing chap. 5 with "Pol." iv. 11 (15). In the former we learn, "Now Solon was in his spoken-style (*ῥῆσει*) and reputation one of the first, but in his property and circumstances (*πράγμασι*) one of the middling class (*τῶν μέσων*); as it is both attested by others and as he himself allows in these poems of his," which the writer then proceeds to quote. The latter says: "A proof of the superiority of the middle class is that the best legislators have been of the middle condition (*τῶν μέσων πολιτῶν*); for example, Solon, as his own verses testify" (Jowett). Now, here we have in the

---

\* The fact that not a few works of leading Aristotelians were placed in the catalogue of Aristotle's own works, in the Ptolemaean age, was believed, or strongly suspected, by Ammonius, who taught at Athens in the fifth century; see his work on the "Categories," fol. 3a. But no suspicion seems to have been specially directed to this treatise.

former a clear rhetorical amplification of the latter. The contrast between the "first class" qualifications and his "middle class" circumstances, is one easy and obvious for any phrase-coiner to devise. Tho "attestation of others" is a similar flower of rhetoric, for no such attestation is adduced, and only Solon's *own* verses follow.

But in the amplification itself there occur two words common enough in themselves, but in the sense here required most unusual. These are *ῥῆσις*, spoken-style, or oratory, or power of expression generally, for possibly Solon's *poems* were in the writer's mind, and *πράγματα* for circumstances, means, or resources. Now *ῥῆσις* in classical Greek means either the act of utterance, or the speech delivered, and where to find an instance of the sense required above I know not. The above sense for *πράγματα* occurs in Polybius \* and is found in the dramatic poets, but is not Aristotelian. Again, how brief and terse is the genuine Aristotelian of the "Politics," *ubi sup.*, *δηλοῖ δ' ἐκ τῆς ποιήσεως*, upon which our rhetorician has spun his two clauses. We seem, then, here to have a glimpse at his method of workmanship.

I give another sample, which I do not think Aristotle could have penned as it stands, although it may have been the honest outcome of some of his notes tacked together in their crude form. In chap. 28 are enumerated, mostly in pairs, the various opposing leaders of the popular and anti-popular parties, the last pair being Theramenes and Kleophon . . . "who also was the first to provide the di-obol (payment out of the theoric fund); and for a while he went on distributing it, but afterwards Kallikrates superseded this, being the first to promise an additional obol. Accordingly, against both of these they passed sentence of death later; for the multitude is accustomed, even though it be misled, to hate subsequently those who induce it to do anything of what is not honourable." There is a sly ironical *naïveté* in the comment here. The notion of the civic body wounded in its nice sense of honour by the proposal of first two-obol pay and then three, pocketing the coin but not the affront, and vindicating its outraged feelings by executing the proposers, forms a point which Aristophanes might have turned to account.

We glean, however, useful light on points of earlier history. The date of Kylon's attempt on the government has been already noted as being ante-Drakonic. The early State of Athens was somewhat like that of Rome before the Decemviral laws, but even more strictly oligarchical. The land, wholly in the hands of the few rich, was let out to the poor, who had the *status* only

\* *πραγμάτων εἶναι κύριον ἱκανῶν*, Polyb. iv. 51 (3); *τόπων καὶ πραγμάτων κύριοι*, *Ibid.* i. 2 (5).

of serfs (ἰδοῦλεον), and cultivated for a rent of one-sixth of the produce (ἱκτημόροι), which, failing to render, they, with wife and children, became actual slaves, nor had they any share in civil privilege or right. This state of things continued until Solon's time; Drako, however, intervened. Brief and cursory as is the mention of him in the "Politics" (ii. 12 (13)), it does not seem to cohere with what one learns from the treatise. Aristotle in the former work says:

Of Drako laws are [extant], but he framed them for a polity already existing; and there is no peculiarity in them worth mentioning, except the greatness and severity of the punishments.

In the treatise, on the contrary, we have a rather complex scheme of polity ascribed to Drako as its author. 1. All were citizens who could furnish themselves with weapons. 2. All magistrates had a property qualification, higher or lower, coupled in some cases with the requirement that they should have legitimate children over ten years of age. 3. A council of four hundred and one members was chosen by lot from the whole civic body over thirty years of age. 4. Over all was the Areopagus as custodian of the laws and a general court of appeal; but the landed oligarchy and the liability to bondage continued as before.

The laws of Drako, except those relating to killing, were swept away by Solon. There is, however, a further surviving link between the two. The three well-known property classes, on which Solon founded the scheme of his polity, are expressly mentioned as recognised in Drako's code. Solon reserved to these the sum total of offices of state, to each a higher or lower office *pro rata*, while he called up the non-propertied class to civic rights in the law courts, and allowed any citizen to bring an action on behalf of any wronged. But in order to cut the knot of social embarrassment, he had to abolish all creditors' claims; and the treatise represents this as not partial or limited, but total and absolute. The appointment to offices of state was through an election by lot from among a larger number selected by vote. The council was retained four hundred strong, striking off its odd member. It is remarkable that in the constitution of Solon the treatise makes no direct mention of the Ekklesia. The notice of it in that of Drako is incidental only: where (chap. 4) the fines for non-attendance are stated, "when there is a session of the Council or the Ekklesia." Doubtless Drako included in it all who were capable of the armed equipment which was the basis of his polity. And it remains doubtful whether the poorest class was so included before the time of Kleisthenes. The singular law inflicting loss of civic rights on any citizen who in a public disturbance sought to remain neutral, was known before

from Plutarch, but is mentioned here. The attempted usurpation of Danaïas between Solon and Peisistratus is a new fact. In the duration of Peisistratus' personal rule there is a slight discrepancy with the "Politics," where it is stated as lasting seventeen years, but here nineteen.

An account of the rising attempted by Harmodius and Aristogeiton against the Peisistratid tyranny, divergent and indeed expressly contradicting the narrative of Thucydides in some important details, is here given. That historian says Hippias was outside the gates in the Kerameikos suburb, and lays great stress on the occasion of the Panathenæa being solemnised by an *armed* procession, as giving the conspirators the hope of a popular fraternisation with its members thus equipped for combat. They, in fact, reckoned on this support against the tyrant's bodyguard. The treatise tells us that Hippias was, on the contrary, in the Akropolis, and denies the "generally reported story," about the citizens appearing on the festival scene in an armed procession, which, it says, was only a later addition of ceremonial. This, indeed, is intended obviously as a correction of the historian, and reconciliation is therefore impossible on the face of it.

We further learn that Munychia, the port of Athens subordinate to Peiræus, was the intended *rendezvous* of Hippias, the son of Peisistratus, when at last he stood at bay against the power of Sparta, now backing the domestic revolt against him. But the Spartans were for once too prompt for their enemy, who probably reckoned too much upon their inertness, besides being encumbered with his domestic train. Again, we learn why Sparta was so responsive to the repeated charges of the oracle. It was the old jealousy of Argos, with which city the Peisistratids had political as well as matrimonial connection, which kindled their zeal against "tyrants."

The statement of the influence recovered by the Areopagus, after the Persian invasion had been repelled (chap. 28), has been already noticed. Yet more decisively, we find, in the summary of successive constitutional phases (chap. 41), "the supremacy (ἐπιστατούσης) of the Areopagus," set down as constituting the sixth among the eleven enumerated. This is an aggrandisement of its powers unknown to us from previous authorities. Something new is also learned about the "generals" (στρατηγοί), who are mentioned as forming an element in the earlier Drakonian constitution (chap. 4), although probably not a novel one even then. They reappear under Solon, chosen "one for each tribe" (chap. 22), whereas later practice chose them all from the total of citizens (chap. 61). Plutarch attests the tribal election as having prevailed down to the time of Kimon. Under which of the "demagogues" the change was effected, is not known; but

whereas the general opinion has been that Plutarch was here in error, it seems fairly probable that he was correct.

It follows from what is said above, and from more that has been left unsaid, that not a few historical readjustments of incidents, characters, and dates will have to be made in case of a new edition of such a work as Grote's "Greece." The part taken by Themistokles in the movement against the Areopagus, although novel in itself, is only one more illustration of the duplicity which was the backbone of his character. He was himself threatened with prosecution on a charge of "Medism" before that tribunal, and had, no doubt, the best reasons for avoiding its scrutiny. So in order to evade the suit, he led up to the overthrow of the Court. He had already a leading ally in Ephialtes, whose movements, however, were not rapid enough for his purposes. He alarmed his more tardy colleague by a false warning that he, too, would shortly be arrested by the Court, at the same time pretending to this latter a knowledge of revolutionary plotters whom he was ready to disclose. This overture accepted, he leads a section of the Court to a spot where he knew Ephialtes was assembled with others, introduces them, and engages them in earnest talk. Ephialtes in alarm takes sanctuary. The Council of Five Hundred was, it should seem, summoned, on which the two allies denounce before it the Areopagitic Court, and repeat the process before the Ekklesia, "until they deprived it of its power." As an outline of facts this seems perfectly credible. Its paradoxical character is merely the result of our ignorance of details. How it was that Themistokles muzzled his accusers, or stifled or discredited their charges so effectually; why no explanation of his *ruse* and timely exposure of his tactics was possible; what were the charges even plausibly adducible "against the Areopagites;" and why these last were unable to organise any effective defence, are puzzling questions to which there is no answer. I do not doubt that the facts as given are derived from Aristotle's genuine jottings. But that he would have left them in this state without any hint as to influences or prejudices which might clothe their startling nakedness with verisimilitude—at least if he had ever designed to publish them—I cannot think. The "Areopagiticus" of Isokrates contained an allusion to the machinations of Themistokles against that Court, which only tantalises our curiosity the more. This is the most striking and dramatic of the incidents which the treatise records. On the other hand, it seems at first sight to extinguish one of the most striking and dramatic of the incidents recorded by Xenophon—the erasion of the name of Theramenes by Kritias from the list of protected citizens under "the Thirty Tyrants" (Xenop. "Hellen." ii. 3; Grote's "Greece," viii. p. 43).

But on closer consideration this seems not to be a necessary conclusion. The treatise (chap. 37) informs us that, after experiencing certain reverses, "the Thirty resolved to disarm the rest, and to destroy Theramenes in the following manner." They procured to be enacted two new laws, one giving summary power to themselves over all *not* on the list of the 3000 protected, the other excluding from existing citizenship (*τῆς παρούσης πολιτείας*) all who had done certain acts which Theramenes was known to have shared. Now Xenophon ("Hellen." ii. 3 (51)) is as clearly aware of the former of these laws as he is ignorant of the latter. But the treatise continues—and here one of those delicate shades of meaning, in which the Greek language is so copious, gives the sentence which follows exactly the degree of uncertainty which rescues it from clashing fatally with Xenophon's statements. Its verbs are in the *imperfect* tense, *not* the tense of completed fact. I therefore render it: \* "So it *was on the point of* happening that, these (*lit.* the) laws once enacted, he (Theramenes) *becomes* outside the civic body, and the Thirty absolutely empowered to put him to death." We may suppose the first law passed, and the famous scene in the Senate House, with the speeches there ascribed by Xenophon to Kritias and Theramenes, to have occurred in the debate on the *second* of the above laws, which was so obviously aimed at Theramenes that Kritias converted his support of the measure into a personal attack upon the man. Theramenes' spirited reply carried the majority of the Senate with him, on which Kritias proceeded by more summary measures, and, fearing the second law might not pass, resolved to make the first suffice, erased the name of his victim, overawed senatorial remonstrance by armed menace, and stood at once master of the situation. Theramenes was accordingly put to death.

But next, mark how in the same chapter our cook has blundered in the arrangement of his materials. Its last sentence is *asyndeton*, but is inserted next to that which records the increase of cruelty and atrocity on the part of "the Thirty" after Theramenes' execution. It is, "They sent envoys to the Lacedaemonians, both *accusing Theramenes*, and requesting succour for themselves." Then follows the fact of the request being granted by the despatch of Lacedaemonian troops under command of Kallibius as a garrison for the Akropolis; and here, too, all the verbs are in the same imperfect tense. Now, is it not plain that this memorandum was left *pendens* by its first hand, let us

---

\* ὥστε συνέβαιεν ἐπικυρωθέντων τῶν νόμων ἔξω τε γίγνεσθαι τῆς πολιτείας αὐτὸν (Theramenes) καὶ τοὺς τριάκοντα κυρίους εἶναι θανατοῦντας, chap. 37, p. 98, l. 24.



suppose Aristotle, and then "compiled" into the wrong place by his literary executor? The notion of sending an embassy to accuse a dead man *might* surely have struck, as a curious fact, the minds of those who were impervious to the force of the imperfect tense. Notwithstanding, the editor gravely points out, that "In this point Xenophon's account seems more probable than that of Aristotle, as it would hardly have been possible for the Thirty to have carried on their Reign of Terror without an armed force at their back" (p. 98, *note*). Of course so; but the inference is that our compiler has got his cart in front of his horse—that is all.

A more formidable difficulty opens with regard to the constitutional fiction of the "Five Thousand" select citizens, to whom, under the ruling council of "Four Hundred," the franchise was proposed by Peisander and the oligarchs to be limited. That they were a potential rather than an actual body is clear from the whole tenor of Thucydides (see viii. 65, 67, 86, 92, 97), and is indeed admitted in this treatise (chap. 32), where we read, "The Five Thousand were selected only nominally" (λογῶς). The difficulty is that in a previous chapter (30), they are treated as exercising functions in their civic capacity which, we are later told, as above, was nominal only. But here again it is clear that the compiler confused his materials, or had no sufficient insight into the facts connected with them to enable him to harmonise them. As he by implication contradicts himself, we may leave him in contradiction with Thucydides. But here again the pertinent question is—Could such a clear mind as Aristotle's have placed such a confusion deliberately on record? Had I space for an independent essay on the subject, I think I could establish an essential harmony between the historian and the facts to be extracted from the treatise. But this is no place for such a prolixion.

More important than any details of such historical scenes or incidents are the modifications of the historic estimate of certain leading characters. Our impression of the magnanimous impartiality and self-denial of Solon is, if possible, enhanced. Plutarch derived from this very treatise the mention of his insight into the designs of Peisistratus on his demanding a bodyguard; and those judge perhaps too much by the event, who censure the lack of brake-power in the constitution which he framed, to arrest the rapid democratic development which succeeded the Persian wars. Of Kleisthenes little new is told us. The inherent duplicity of Themistokles receives, as above, one further illustration; and the date of his quitting Attic soil must be drawn further down. Aristides "the just" appears much fuller of sympathy for the popular party than he has been hitherto regarded as being. He

is mentioned as the author of the vast increase in the number of citizens who drew public pay for their services, here set down as in his time twenty thousand. And although these steps were taken subsequent to his return from his period of ostracism, yet the general bent of his political character makes that ostracism a still graver reproach on the public policy of Athens, while on its particular causes no fresh light is thrown. Perikles is somewhat deposed from the stately pedestal on which Thucydides places him. He is rated as the first and worthiest of the demagogues; but his invention of the paid dikasteries, in which several hundred citizens together administered justice at three obols a day, is clearly exposed as a party-bid for influence against the personally lavish liberality of Kimon which he had no other means of counteracting. This policy is condemned in the "Politics," and its results in practice exposed. The treatise tells us (chap. 27):

Perikles first introduced wage-earning dikasts, owing to which some allege that they have become worse. Subsequently, also, bribery set in (*ἡρξάτο*), Anytus being the first example of it after the expedition to (lit. "in") Pylos. For when brought to trial by certain persons for his losing Pylos, he bribed the dikastery and got off.

The impression left by this certainly is, that Anytus' case was the first, but not the last, and that bribery became a not uncommon practice. In "Pol." vi. 5, some strong opinions are expressed on this dikasterian machinery, stronger indeed than Aristotle usually allows himself. Thus (3) we read:

The demagogues of our own day often get property confiscated in the law courts in order to please the people. But those who have the welfare of the State at heart should counteract them, and make a law that the property of the condemned which goes into the treasury should not be public but sacred. Thus offenders will be as much afraid, for they will be punished all the same, and the people, having nothing to gain, will not be so ready to condemn the accused. . . . (4) It is the practice to indict, not members of the popular party, but the notables; although the citizens ought to be all equally attached to the State, or at any rate, should not regard their rulers as enemies. And further (5) the money [to pay the courts] must be obtained by a property-tax and confiscations and corrupt practices of the courts, things which have before now overthrown many democracies; and (7) where there are revenues, the demagogues should not be allowed to distribute the surplus; the poor are always receiving, and always wanting more and more, *for such help is like water poured into a leaky cask*.

Now, with these very pertinent and forcible remarks on record in the "Politics," it seems extraordinary in Aristotle, although

it need not be so in another writer, that when directly crossing the same ground in the *Πολιτεία*, he should forbear all reference, and despatch so vital a subject with such dry and guarded remarks as are quoted above.

In the above extract the opening phrase, "the demagogues of our own day," makes it clear that Aristotle was speaking from personal observation, and that the "law courts" intended were, or at least included, those of Athens. The mischief generated by the party tactics of Perikles was, therefore, deplorably vivacious. It outlasted the independence of Athens herself. Whilst she flourished, great as well as free, it had been the plague-spot of her empire; when the "Politics" were written, it was still surviving as the canker of her individual civic life. But in an earlier passage from the same work, which I shall have to quote next, the fatal unsoundness of the principle involved is, perhaps, even more forcibly pointed out. It is noted in iv. 13 (5) as among

the counter-devices of democracies to pay the poor for attending the assemblies and the law courts, and inflict no penalty on the rich for non-attendance. It is obvious that he who would duly mix the two principles should combine the practice of both, and provide that the poor should be paid to attend, and the rich fined if they do not attend, for then all will take part. If there is no such combination, power will be in the hands of one party only.

This device of Perikles was therefore one-sided, and, acting in combination with events which his war policy brought about, was so fruitful in internal germs of discord and disaster as to be worth dwelling upon a little more fully.

It was the policy of Peisistratus to occupy the mass of the citizens as far as possible in those agricultural pursuits which kept them out of city life, and nursed in them a distaste for its excitements. Of course maritime ascendancy and commercial development altered and even reversed the conditions which had made this possible. To Aristides is ascribed the policy (chap. 24) of directly encouraging the concentration of the people in the capital at the expense of their rural pursuits, which must have been delegated to hirelings or slaves, and there sustaining them by public pay on a lavish scale. But when the Peloponnesian war, with its annual invasions, made all unvalled tenements the mark of devastation, Perikles consoled them by pointing to the city as their safe retreat, and deprecated their poignant regret for the loss of their rural homesteads. If the development of public service by Aristides enticed them, the war policy of Perikles in effect drove them, to concentrate within and behind the walls. The first result, as we know, was the Great Plague. But its devastations, however tragical, were temporary; but the

moral mischief of so many thousands drawn to the city to subsistas best they could, left them hungry for the bait of the public pay in the courts, for there only was a sure, if scanty, wage to be earned. Few days probably passed without some of these courts sitting, whereas the Ekklesia met stately some thrice a month only, although oftener in emergencies. When every needful abatement has been made for the prejudice of partisanship, and the exaggerations inherent in caricature, we have yet in "*The Wasps*" of Aristophanes a picture of civic degradation true in its broad outlines, fitting exactly the circumstances, and in its consequences the most permanently disastrous of any. The honey which drew "the wasps" was that pay for attendance which formed the last refuge of the needy citizen.

This institution, then, was Perikles' device, and was fostered by the state of things which his policy, once adopted, forced upon the city. It possessed a subtly mischievous power in stimulating its own growth and propagating its own bane. To keep the dikastery fund from ebbing low, especially as public disasters multiplied into private losses under the exhausting struggle of a long war, what would be the obvious resource of the professional dikasts? Obviously to levy fines and inflict confiscations wherever there was a plausible case for so doing. Thus we reach a state of things under which human selfishness, being a tolerably constant quality, would make the court the natural enemy of every wealthy defendant. Then comes before us the hateful array of hireling informers and pettifogging perjurers who acted to the court as pioneers to an army.

The tendency would always be to set the poor to prey upon the rich and prostitute the machinery of justice to the exacerbation of their mutual antipathies. With the absence of men of wealth from the court (always except at its bar as defendants), there would follow the exclusion of higher education and more cultured feeling. While, if on any occasion they took their turn as dikasts, they would find themselves little else than suspects, bereft of all influence which could leaven the mass and correct the tendency. Further, when we remember that four or five hundred sat together to decide at once on law and on fact, and on the application of the one to the other, and this without any trained expert to guide them, and all without appeal, we find that we have already reached the bounds of caricature, and that there was little left for the comedian to exaggerate.

This machine of legalised extortion in daily operation, largely worked by the vulture swarm of hireling informers who flourished and fattened on it, made the worthiest citizen a constant prey to the vilest. After all the costly sacrifices made, the men who had made the greatest felt that they had been made in vain.

What possibility was there of domestic peace and personal security within the walls, when each dikastery was a band of needy bravoës, each armed with his stiletto vote? Why not join hands with the Spartans outside? Such were the questions which had a disintegrating effect on Attic patriotism, and probably even yet more so on the Athenian empire. Every citizen of Samos or Byzantium was liable to be haled before such a court, where the worst weakness of popular government was a standing menace to justice. This added a constant sting of oppression to the bond of subjection, and made a festering grievance, where every dictate of sound policy would have kept the yoke from galling. And this dismal heritage it was which Athens derived from her greatest and most typical statesman, and which is denounced in the terms quoted above by her most practical, if not her greatest, philosopher. But if Plato and Aristotle divide the crown of ancient philosophy, they here agree.

Tell me yet this [says Sokrates in Plato's "Gorgias"], whether the Athenians are said through Perikles' means to have become better, or, on the contrary, to have been corrupted by him? For what I hear is that Perikles made them idle, cowardly, chatter-boxes, and covetous, by first throwing State-wages in their way.

In short, under this *régime*, of which Perikles' influence was the greatest factor, the polity had veered round completely to the extreme opposite to that which the wise measures of Solon had corrected. Before him the rich had tyrannised over the poor, now the poor tyrannised over the rich. Either extreme was baneful; but the latter was a bane which found no antidote. With Perikles, accordingly, incorrupt himself, but the corrupter of his countrymen, Aristotle's sympathies, as represented in this treatise, are scanty; with Solon, whose constitution lay in that golden mean, the temperate zone of all virtue, they are large. Nor need one doubt that the representation is correct. For Nikias the admiration expressed is limited to the political sphere and does not extend to his generalship. He is classed with Thucydides (not the historian) and Tahermenes, as

the best statesman, after those of old, whom Athens had produced. On the merits of the former two nearly all are agreed, that they were not only men of high moral tone, but in the political sphere, too, worthy citizens and good patriots. Only on Theramenes, owing to the tumultuous character of the political times on which he was cast, is there a diversity of judgment. To those, however, who judge not superficially, he appears, not, as misrepresented, a man who upset all forms of government, but who supported all, so far as they transgressed no principle, and was able to adapt himself politically to all—the characteristic, surely, of a good citizen—and

because he made no concessions to those which violated the constitution, therefore incurring hatred (chap. 28).

This vindication of an aspersed memory is one of the most remarkable passages in the whole treatise. I cannot here persuade myself that we have Aristotle's genuine judgment. As regards its matter it seems improbable, and there is not, as there is abundantly in the case of Perikles, any confirmation of it derivable from the "Politics." As regards the manner, it seems to me to savour of Plato and Demosthenes far more than of Aristotle. I incline, therefore, to ascribe it to the rhetorical compiler, or cooker, of whom we have seen not a few traces. Of all important names, that of Alkibiades is most conspicuously absent, and the whole affair of the mutilation of the Hermæ and the alleged violation of the mysteries, which, although not directly the cause of any constitutional change, had yet a profound influence on the state of parties, is left a blank. In chap. 34 a singular misstatement of facts is noticed by the editor—viz., that "the ten generals," who commanded at Arginussæ, "were condemned *all* by a single vote, although some had not even been present at it, while others were indebted to other ships for their own rescue." The two who were absent, as is well known from Xenophon, were never even tried. It seems to me very unlikely that, on a matter of fact so notorious and easily verifiable, Aristotle should have been guilty of such a slip.

I come next to what I must touch as lightly as possible—the question of verbal style and phrase. It is clear that the writer, whoever he was, had not only a large body of Aristotle's memoranda before him, but had acquired a considerable trick of his style, so that he was able to cook the morsels, as it were, in not quite their native juice, but in a very passable "mock-turtle" variation upon it. The frequency of *μὲν οὖν* as a connective is quite Aristotelian. Opening the "Politics" at haphazard, I come upon this five times in six pages of Goëttling's text. Less frequent in the philosopher's usage is *μετὰ ταῦτα*, and this phrase is by the Peripatetic cooker slightly overdone. He has also in many passages fairly caught the careless, jotting style, which makes the philosopher's genuine (as accepted) writings often resemble an auctioneer's catalogue. His weak side is shown when his rhetorical tastes lead him to diverge, and he drops the dry "ditto, ditto," manner in order to affect variations. As examples take chap. 19, where, in the space of seven lines, we have the same people spoken of as "Laconians," then as "Lacedæmonians," then as "Spartans," then as "Lacedæmonians" again. Still more generously in chap. 28, he gives us for the same party, the anti-popular, the term *ἐπικρείς*, then *εὐγενεῖς* with *γνώριμοι*,



again γνῶριμοι alone, next εὐποροί, then vaguely ἔτεροι, then ἐπιφανείς, and lastly ἔτεροι again. This is the same chapter which contains the relishing *morceau* on the democratic sense of wounded honour avenged by the execution of those who proposed payment for legislation.

The cooker, again, gives us mostly, although not always, the term Ἀρεοπαγῖτα (or εἶ), whereas in the "Politics," and I think elsewhere too, Aristotle's phrase is ἡ ἐν τῷ Ἀρείῳ πάγῳ βουλὴ, or the like.\* The persistent use in the treatise of διοικεῖν and διοικήσεις for the ordinary terms meaning "manage" or "govern," is largely in excess of Aristotelian proportion, and is probably a result of familiarity with the orators. In chap. 2, ἀγῶγμοι for "reduced to slavery" is Demosthenic rather than Aristotelian. The use of ἐπίθετα twice for what we call "prerogatives" (chaps. 3 and 25) is startling, and cannot, I think, be Aristotle's, who uses the word in the "Rhetoric" for the "adjectives" of grammar. προσεκεκόσμηντο for "were reckoned (arrayed) amongst" is equally strange; so is φύσει for "by birth." συνιστήσαντο τὸν πόλεμον for "engaged in war" is a phrase of Polybius, but suspicious here; ὑποφερομένη, "being overborne," used of an institution or constitution (chaps. 25 and 36), is hardly less so. δεκάζειν (chap. 27 *bis*) for "to bribe," is oratorical again, and probably began as a slang word—"to tip" a man. παρέρως ἀποφαινομένοις (chap. 28), "judging superficially, or inattentively," is from the same stock. A more glaring phrase still is οὐχ οἶον . . . ἀλλὰ καὶ, for "not only . . . but also" (chap. 40). It occurs Polyb. i. 20 (12), and probably was a vulgarism adopted by the rhetorical writers. On page 111, we find ὁσημέραι as printed, but are told ὅσαι ἡμέραι is the MS. text, neither, I think, Aristotelian, for "every-day." ἐκρουν ἐχομένους (chap. 50), if correct, for the -ένους is editorial supplement, seems suspicious. We should expect ἔχοντας, but perhaps ἐκπροχομένους should be read. ὅσαπερ εἰάν "whatever," or "what number soever" (chap. 63) has a late flavour.

Finally, ἐμπηγνύτης (p. 162 *bis*) is base and late. Hesychius is quoted for ἐμπήκτης "a notice-poster." I have above only noticed words or phrases which seem to bear on the question of genuineness. The MS. seems full of corrupt readings, and will require a vast deal of scholarly sifting before its text is acquiesced in. It gives one by this an interesting standard for the facility and rapidity of corruption. Found in Egypt, and presumably at no great distance from Alexandria, it was easily corrigible by the aid of the greatest library and most skilful experts of the ancient world. In that library what passed for

\* See "Pol." ii. 12 (2) (4), v. 4 (8), 12 (2).

the archetype was probably treasured. If, with these advantages, it is so full of errors, what must we not allow for others less fortunately circumstanced?

Nothing trustworthy can be extracted from the Arab diggers as to its site. But the same papyrus contains "on the *recto* side accounts of receipts and expenditure," dated in Greek as "of the eleventh year of Vespasian" (A.D. 78). It is reasonably inferred that the use of the *verso* for copying a MS. would be at no very long time later, since the papyrus is not likely to have continued unused and undestroyed for very many years after the accounts had ceased to be of interest. The MS. may therefore be reasonably dated within the first century A.D., or at latest very early in the second ("Introduction," pp. xiii, xiv.).

The learned world is indebted to Mr. F. G. Kenyon, of Magdalen College, Oxford, for a lucid and most readable apparatus of introduction and notes done apparently under great pressure of public impatience. Of course there are slips here and there which a more deliberate recension would have avoided. Thus *θυρίδας*, "windows" (chap. 50), is annotated to mean "doors" (*θύρας*).

Nor does his acquaintance with the recent researches of foreign scholars concerning various officers of state at Athens seem up to date. But, although experts in Athenian archæology may find much in his views to challenge, the average student is greatly indebted to him for valuable assistance given.

HENRY HAYMAN, D.D.

---

# ART. VIII.—THE ANGLICAN CLAIM TO HISTORICAL CHRISTIANITY.

*The Throne of the Fisherman.* By T. W. ALLIES, K.C.S.G.  
London: Burns & Oates.

**B**ISHOP OVERALL, the Coryphæus, in his day, of High Anglicans, and author of part of the Catechism in the Anglican Prayer-book, gives us, in his celebrated 'Convocation Book,' his ideal of the government of the Christian Church, viz., Christians of particular congregations to be directed by their immediate pastors; pastors to be ruled by their bishops; bishops to be advised by their archbishops, with all the rest, both clergy and laity, to be ruled and governed by their godly king and sovereign princes. The constitution of particular or national Churches being thus defined, they are all said to belong to the Catholic Church by virtue of being under Christ Himself; *not through belonging to the Papacy, or any Patriarchate* (Book ii. 7).

Tract XC., vindicated by Dr. Pusey, held that "each Church "is independent of all the rest, and is to act on the principle of "what may be called 'episcopal independence,' except, indeed, so "far as the civil power unites any number of them together."

Bishop Stubbs justifies the present position of the Church of England on historical grounds, on the theory of "the independence of national Churches."\*

This is, indeed, the only theory that could clear the Church of England from the guilt of schism, supposing that it possessed a valid Episcopate.

And this is supposed to be *historical Christianity*. History is asserted to be the strong point of the Anglican position.

"History is our best ally," says an organ of the High Church party. Canon Carter speaks of the "tendency to search into "history, to test the present by the past, rather than trust to the "mere dicta of authority," as the guiding principle of the so-called Reformation.† Mr. Gore considers that his own party in the Church of England, however much it lack, at any rate enjoys a monopoly of history.‡

But especially is this claim made with regard to the history of the primitive Church. Here Anglicans have thought them-

\* "Eastern Church Association Papers," No. 1.

† "The Roman Question," p. 166, 2nd edition.

‡ "Roman Catholic Claims," ch. vii., *passim*, compared with the last chapter.

selves on the surest possible ground; and one might almost say that they have added to the notes of the Church that of 'Primitivity.'

We propose, therefore, to consider, in a short sketch, the claim set up on the part of Anglicans to represent historical Christianity on this particular point, viz., episcopal independence, testing it by the first four centuries. But it is important to bear in mind that the value of what is called historical proof can never take the place in the mind of a Catholic that it does in that of the Anglican. The Catholic has a divine faith in a living authority, viz., the Catholic and Roman Church. He is sure that the Church, by divine instinct, knows her own past, and can never contradict that past. She is 'a moral person,'\* full of the Holy Ghost, secure of divine assistance in the promulgation of the faith. Hence, speaking of all human histories, a Catholic can always say, when the decision of the Church clashes with *this or that man's* history (and it always comes to that), "so much the worse for history"—not, of course, for history as known to the Divine Wisdom, but for history as written by merely human authors, even though the author be one who could plead in his favour (as Dr. Döllinger did) his "scientific culture of mind."† It is important also to bear in mind that (as Cardinal Manning has said in his exquisite treatise on "The Temporal Mission of the Holy Ghost") "human histories can afford no adequate 'motive of divine certainty.'" And again, "The reason or 'private judgment of individuals exercised critically upon history, 'philosophy, theology, Scripture, and revelation, inasmuch as it is 'the most human, is also the most fallible and uncertain of 'all principles of faith, and cannot in truth be rightly described 'to be such. Yet this is ultimately all that remains to those 'who reject the infallibility of the living Church.'"‡

But true and important as this principle is, no one more convincingly showed that the history of Honorius had been mis-read by Père Gratry, than did the Cardinal himself. For it is part of the Church's merciful errand to clear away difficulties that bar the entrance, or impede the progress, of the light of faith.

This has been done, with regard to the polity of the Christian Church, as seen in the first five centuries of the Christian era, by the volume in Mr. Allies' series on the Formation of Christendom, which we have placed at the head of this article. 'The Throne of the Fisherman' is, in our judgment, the finest of all the writer's volumes, except, perhaps, his last, recently issued, on "The 'Rock of Peter, and Mohammed's Flood.'"§

\* See "Religio Viatoris," by Cardinal Manning, ch. iv.

† See Döllinger's letter to Dr. Nevin, in the *Times*, Jan. 18, 1890.

‡ "Temporal Mission of the Holy Ghost," pp. 97, 98.

Which, then, of these rightly interprets history—the Church of England up to the beginning of the sixteenth century, or that which has gone by the name of the Church of England since that time? Both cannot be right. It is absolutely impossible, having regard to the ordinary laws of logic, to reconcile, for instance, Archbishop Peckham in the thirteenth century, and Archbishop Benson in the nineteenth.

Here is Archbishop Peckham's\* exposition of his faith in a letter which he wrote to King Edward I. He says that, "from old time a bitter strife has gone on between the Kings and nobles of England on the one side, and the Archbishops, and Bishops, and Clergy of the same Kingdom on the other side, for the oppression of the Church, contrary to the decrees of the Sovereign Pontiffs, contrary to the statutes of Councils, contrary to the sanctions of the orthodox fathers," &c.—and he says that an end will be put to this contention only if his Highness the King will bend before those three authorities, as did Catholic Emperors before him. He continues: "The Sovereign Lord of all gave authority to the decrees of the Sovereign Pontiffs, when He said to Peter in the Gospel of Matthew, 'Whatsoever thou shalt bind on earth, shall be bound in Heaven;'" and then he deals with what he supposes "an Enemy of the Church" to say, viz., that it does not belong to the Sovereign Pontiff to impose the yoke of laws and canons of this kind on a secular Prince, and forthwith he points out the deadly sin of disobeying the decrees of the Pontiff.

Now, between this (which was the belief of every Archbishop of Canterbury until the line came to an end with Cranmer's apostasy) and Bishop Overall's theory of national independence, there is a chasm so vast, that even if the present Church of England held the same doctrine on all other points as the old Church of England (which, of course, it does not), the continuity between the two would be snapped, and irrevocably lost.

The question, then, before us is, Which is historical Christianity—that which Archbishop Peckham taught, or that which Bishop Overall and Dr. Pusey taught, and which Bishop Stubbs and Bishop King teach now, on the subject of Episcopal independence?

With the help of Mr. Allies' magnificent volume, although using our own mode of presenting the subject, we shall endeavour to show in short compass that the Anglican theory of Church government has no standing point whatever in the historical Christianity of the first three centuries and a half, which will carry us to the Nicene Council.

\* The importance of this Archbishop's teaching is considerable, since he is quoted by the Commission on Ecclesiastical Courts as a kind of father of the statutes of the "National Church."

The Church is both a kingdom and a household. In her aspect as a kingdom, her government is monarchical; as a household, she is ordered by a chief steward, who is to arrange and dispense, in his Master's name, the food of salutary doctrine and sacramental life. "Whilst the world belongs to God, the Church is "His house, of which the Ruler at this time is Damasus," says St. Basil.\* Both of these aspects are contained in our Lord's commission to St. Peter after his resurrection—"Feed My sheep" (βόσκει), and again, "Shepherd My sheep" (ποιμαίνει). And in both of these aspects the See of St. Peter appears in the history of the first four centuries of the Christian era.

In the very first writings of the Christian Church, the Church of Rome, that is, the Bishop with Council (or the strings of the harp, to use St. Ignatius's *simile*) emerges in this twofold aspect. The occupant of that See comes before us within the lifetime of the Apostle St. John, and settles a disturbance in a region that, on the Anglican theory, would belong to the jurisdiction of that Apostle. He appears in the possession of a living tradition of Divine truth, and as its exponent with respect to the worship and government of the whole Church.† Here at the very outset the nature of the Church's jurisdiction arises. Jurisdiction is defined to be "the cognition of causes belonging to the magistracy by right of his office."‡ Where was the magistracy in the Christian Church under whose cognisance such an important matter would come as the deposition of clergy in a city not far from Ephesus? It was in Rome.

The circumstances were as follows: The Church in Corinth had for some time been torn by dissensions, and had caused the utmost scandal on all sides. A few fiery spirits, with a considerable following, had succeeded in extruding at least their Bishop and some Presbyters, if not, indeed, one or more Bishops in the neighbourhood, from their sacred office (ἐπισκοπῆς), who had, nevertheless, in the judgment of St. Clement executed their liturgical duties without reproach, and had done nothing in any way to merit censure. The Church of Rome intervened, whether on appeal as many think, or *proprio motu*, as Bishop Lightfoot thinks, it is difficult to say.§ The persecutions (under Nero and

\* Damasus was then Pope.

† Lightfoot's "Apostolic Fathers," Part i., vol. ii. § xl. *et seq.*, and Constant, Ep. Rom. Pont., col. 28.

‡ "Bianchi," 3, 474, quoted by Allies in "Church and State," p. 306.

§ Bishop Lightfoot is doubtless right in pointing out that it is not *παρ' ἑμῶν*, but *παρ' ὑμῶν*, and that therefore the opening paragraph does not oblige us to see an appeal. But that being so, the exercise of authority is still more striking, if Rome takes the initiative. It seems more likely, however, to have been a case of appeal.



Domitian) had alone precluded the Church of Rome from intervening in the affairs of the Church at Corinth sooner.\* But as soon as was possible, St. Clement wrote a letter, which Dr. Lightfoot characterises as 'almost imperious,' and which St. Irenæus spoke of as 'most powerful' or 'most adequate.' In this letter St. Clement speaks of the tradition they had received in Rome from the Apostles themselves as to the government and teaching of the Church. Speaking of the government of the Church, he produces its type in the old Covenant, with its High Priest, Priests, and Levites. He says that the Apostles, by way of rendering their work permanent, everywhere ordained Bishops and Deacons. He magisterially reproves the ring-leaders of the disturbances in Corinth, and says with regard to the clergy whom they had extruded, that it "will be a sin in us" to depose them from their Episcopal office (*ἐπισκοπῆς*). He says that "we" speak with the authority of God, and warns the Corinthian Christians against disobeying the injunctions now given them. The whole letter is a magnificent combination of high-souled expostulation and tender desire for the welfare of the Church in Corinth.

Such was the first recorded act of the Church of Rome. And it is spoken of in terms of enthusiasm by St. Irenæus, from whom we gather that the Corinthians amended their ways, and peace was restored. It is alluded to also with commendation by St. Ignatius on his way to his martyrdom.

Bishop Lightfoot endeavours to parry the incidence of all this upon the Anglican position by maintaining that (1) it is the Church and not the Bishop of Rome that thus acts, and (2) that the Church of Rome owed her ascendancy, which enabled her thus to act, to her moral majesty and to her natural position. As regards the contention that it was the Church and not the Bishop of Rome that thus exercises supremacy at the very beginning, he lays the greatest stress on the fact that St. Clement's name does not appear in the letter, and that he constantly uses the pronoun "we." He admits, however, that the letter was written by St. Clement, and calls it an "incident in his administration" of the Church. He thinks that St. Clement "suppressed" his name, as not being in such a position of authority as is implied in our word Bishop. He considers that his "personality was absorbed" in the Church, of which he was the leading member. And he holds that the Corinthians had not yet arrived at the Episcopal form of government, and that no argument can be derived from St. Clement's letter in favour of episcopacy having been already developed in those regions. Part of this theory really rests on Dr. Lightfoot's

---

\* Clem. Epist., § i.

well-known interpretation of the word 'Bishop' in the New Testament. He contends that 'bishops and deacons' in Phil. i. 1, can only mean 'presbyters,' because there would only be one bishop at Philippi; and that as St. Clement speaks of the Apostles having gone about instituting 'bishops and deacons,' he, too, can only mean 'presbyters and deacons.' It is, however, theologically certain that when St. Paul speaks of the 'presbyters of the Church' at Miletus, he is speaking of what we now call bishops, as the following words imply;\* and again, when the Apostle says to Titus that he has left him in Crete to ordain 'presbyters' in each city, he is also, as the following words show, speaking of presbyter-bishops, in other words, of bishops. The word presbyter does not exclude that rank which combines the episcopal office with the priesthood. And the Christian ministry might very well be started with a presbyter-bishop and the diaconate. All the functions of the ministry can be performed by the two, seeing that the bishop contains the priest within himself. And the Epistle which the Apostle addressed to the Philippians was probably an Encyclical to the Churches of Macedonia, which included many bishops, just as the presbyters who assembled at Miletus were clearly not from Ephesus alone, but from the whole province, so to speak. So that this theory, brought from an erroneous interpretation of Holy Scripture, and applied to St. Clement's letter, may be dismissed. Nothing in that letter prevents us supposing that the Bishop of Corinth was amongst those who were being thrust out of their places. Indeed, St. Irenæus uses the very words, in combination, of the appointment of St. Linus to the episcopate (*λειτουργίαν ἐπισκοπῆς*), which St. Clement uses in two successive paragraphs, of those who had been extruded. St. Clement, as we have said, actually gives a sketch, in type, of the Christian ministry, and it consists of three orders. We cannot, therefore, reasonably suppose that the Church in Corinth, after so many years, would be without what St. Clement lays down as part of the Divine tradition as to the government of the Church. It is, indeed, not impossible that St. Clement alludes to the successive degradation of more than one bishop, using, as he does, the plural; or he may, with equal probability, be considered to allude to the simultaneous extrusion of more than one bishop in the neighbourhood. And this supposition finds support from the opening sentence of the letter, in which he uses the expression *παροικίᾳ* of the Church to which he writes. This, no doubt, as Dr. Lightfoot points out, implies the idea of their being 'sojourners,' as Christians: but as *παροικία* certainly afterwards denoted the aggregate of Christian communities

---

\* Cf. Council of Trent, sess. 23, chap. iv.

within a large district, each with their own bishop, it may well have in this instance an anticipation of its future meaning; and Corinth, like Ephesus,\* may have been the nucleus of several surrounding centres of Christian life, each with its own episcopal supervision. St. Clement's words concerning the Corinthian Church are certainly sufficiently strong to cover the case of a general state of disturbance which had spread through the neighbouring regions, whose main feature was rebellion against constituted authority, and authority consisting, as the government of the Jewish Church did, of a triple ministry.

And it would be still more unreasonable to suppose that St. Clement, whilst using the name of the whole Church at Rome, does not speak with the authority of an official position. Popes do not now act without their "Congregations." And in early times they were in the constant habit of making use of a Council of the surrounding bishops. St. Julius, in his celebrated letter to the Eusebians, speaks rather of the Church in Rome than of himself; yet no one doubts that he, at least, was speaking of the Petrine prerogative attaching to his See. Popes acted upon the principle which St. Cyprian laid down for himself in commencing the work of his diocese. He determined to do nothing without concerted action, not by way of putting his episcopal authority into commission, but in the exercise of a holy *ἐπικουρία*. The idea which most Anglicans entertain of the infallibility of the Pope is altogether misleading, through ignoring this feature of Papal government. The exercise of Papal infallibility, and the decision of a Council, are invariably supposed by such writers to be two separate things, in the sense that two speeches uttered by two different persons are separate. But they are really but as two sentences uttered by the same person, with all the unity which a single sound mind, expressing itself consecutively, but with unity of purpose, gives to an emphatic utterance. They are as the 'Amen, Amen' of the Divine Head. The promulgation of a dogmatic decision such as St. Leo's tome, was complete in its authority, as it came from the See of St. Peter; it was completed in its *impressive power* by the sentence of the Council. The agreement of the Council was to the eye of faith certain. A real difference between the Pope and a Council of the Church, though theoretically conceivable, and therefore capable of being discussed in words, is practically impossible. Infallibility is an attribute of the Church; unity is one of her notes. The members of the Council by yielding themselves up to the power of the truth which has been announced by the Pope, declare their membership in the Church. Their judgment

\* See this drawn out by Franzelin, "De Ecclesiâ," p. 291.

is a free act, and an act of authority, but it could not (by reason of our Lord's promise to be with the Church) be opposed to the judgment of the Holy See. The head and the body cannot be severed. As a Synod of Rheims in 1699 expresses the matter: "The consent of the Bishops to the judgment of the Holy See is "at once an act of obedience to the first See, and an act of "authority and judgment under the principal authority of that "same See." The Episcopate is not thus reduced to a nonentity; its judgment and consent are part of the life of the Church, but in the case of an Ecumenical Council, their consent could not but follow, for a broken unity must involve the loss of infallibility, and the Church would have then ceased to be. The gates of hell would have prevailed against her. But this could not be, for He who promised the contrary was God Himself, one with the Father, in the unity of the Holy Ghost. The judgment, therefore, of a Council manifests the unity of the Church; and it corresponds to the emphasis which voice, gesture, and the movement of the entire body lend to the utterance of a man's lips. Bishop Lightfoot's argument, that St. Clement's letter being called the letter of the Church of Rome was not an exercise of Papal authority, proceeds, therefore, upon a mistaken notion of how that authority speaks. It was the Church, he insists, not the Episcopate. Our reply is that you cannot separate the two. It was, as St. Jerome says, written by St. Clement '*ex personâ ecclesiæ*' as all Papal decisions are. And the wide distinction that Bishop Lightfoot draws between St. Clement's letter and St. Victor's subsequent action rests on no facts that have as yet been produced. He admits, on the one hand, that St. Clement of Alexandria on more than one occasion speaks of the letter in question as that of St. Clement (of Rome), and he must have admitted, on the other hand, that we have no sufficient data for asserting that St. Victor did not act in concert with a Council at Rome, or that he never used the expression "we." Yet this is the *pièce de résistance* in Bishop Lightfoot's argument. In St. Victor's case, he maintains, the Episcopate steps on to the scene, and all is changed; in St. Clement's, it is the Church not the Episcopate. The case is, of course, desperate for an Anglican, if it be true that history opens with an authoritative letter from the Bishop of Rome, claiming to speak with the authority of God, as this letter does—and a letter praised by St. Irenæus and St. Ignatius, and read in the Church of Corinth, side by side with Holy Scripture itself. And the only course open to a scholar like the late Bishop Lightfoot was to argue from the use of the plural. Its authoritative tone no one who has read the letter through could ever deny. Its claim to be in possession of a living tradition as to the scheme of Redemption, apart from Holy

Scripture, and as to the government of the Church, is in exact accordance with the Papal claim of the nineteenth century ; its consciousness of a right to intervene in the disturbances of another Church, whether spontaneously or on appeal, underlies every sentence of its majestic utterances ; and its simple assertion that in what it says, it is secure of Divine assistance, sounds like the 'Pastor Æternus' of Pius IX. more than anything else in the history of the Church. Show then that it is the Church, and *not* the Pope, and the edge of its witness against the Anglican position is supposed to be turned. But for the Catholic contention it is sufficient that the letter was that of the Church *and* the Pope, of which there can be no doubt. For the further question then remains, What is the informing power of the infallibility of the Church ? Where is its seat ? That question naturally is not answered directly in St. Clement's letter, though it is indirectly suggested. St. Clement's heading to his letter, which claims infallibility, with the name of the Church of Rome, suggests it ; for no one supposes that the local Church of Rome was itself infallible. The infallibility of the Pope consists in Divine "assistance;" and there is nothing to prevent the "assistance," which secures him from error under certain conditions, being given to his use of ordinary means, such as the co-operation of a Council. A Council of some sort there must have been at Rome, unless St. Clement wrote without conferring with any one, for no one supposes that each inhabitant of the Suburra had his say. St. Clement therefore writes his letter with Divine assistance, and tells the Corinthians so ; he associates with himself the rest of the Church, as St. Paul writing to the Galatians associates with himself "all the brethren who are with me," though the inspiration was all his own.

Bishop Lightfoot, moreover, attributes the position assumed by the Church of Rome in this matter to her position at the centre of the world's empire, and to her superior goodness. We might ask, could the Church of Rome already have shown such superior charity as to justify her in taking up a position of authority over other Churches ; \* and how could the prestige of the Imperial centre communicate itself to a religious body living for the most part in the wretched haunts of the Suburra, and consisting mostly of converted Jews and Greeks of low origin ? For the Christian Church was not 'established' in Rome ; it could not partake of the prestige of the city in that way. But we prefer to point out and to insist, that the terms used in St.

\* He understands St. Ignatius' expression *προκαθήμενη τῆς ἀγάπης* of superiority in 'practical goodness.' But the genitive case implies rather that 'the love' was that *over* which the Church of Rome presided, 'the love' being a synonym for the 'Covenant of love,' i.e., the Church.

Clement's letter are wholly inconsistent with either one or the other of these two grounds. They would be altogether unbecoming in people who had simply acquired a great position through 'practical goodness,' as Bishop Lightfoot expresses it. They would be simply preposterous, were their authoritative tone due to a position acquired through the geographical position of the Church in Rome. If any one will take the trouble to read this grand letter through in the original with this question in his mind: Is it a person speaking with the authority of an official position, or is it only a community delivering its own traditions, and advice, and warnings, and recommending them as certainly the voice of the Holy Ghost? (as the newly discovered portion of this letter does), we can have little doubt that he will rise from the perusal with the feeling that it is a person, *and* the community; but a person with authority, speaking with his community, that thus simply and majestically rolls off his sentences of dogmatic deliverance, tender appeal, and solemn warning.

Bishop Lightfoot calls this the "only recorded incident in St. Clement's administration of the Church," and says that it is "undoubtedly" "the first step towards Papal domination." And it is allowed on all hands that there was no protest against "this first step" in the very lifetime of the Apostle St. John. On the contrary, St. Irenæus and St. Ignatius praise it, and Corinth treasures the letter to read at Divine service on the Lord's Day for years to come. Here then, in 'historical Christianity' in its first appearance in the records that we have of the first century, there is, at least, no trace of Anglicanism. On the contrary, it is in exact accord with the Catholic and Roman position. The first letter in Christian history dwells with tremendous power on the evils of schism; speaks of the possession at Rome of a living tradition received from the Apostles; requires accord with the form of government contained in that tradition; deals with the deposition of clergy in a distant Province, refusing to sanction it; majestically and pathetically insists on the duty of repentance in those who have so acted, claims to be the mouthpiece of the Holy Ghost—it emanates from Rome, it concludes with speaking of the Legates it has sent, and it is read for years after in the course of public service side by side with the Epistles of St. Paul. This at its very commencement is 'historical Christianity.'

Compare with this first disclosure of the spirit of the Christian Church, a letter from St. Leo to the Patriarch of Alexandria, in the fifth century. The Pope there says that it would be impious to believe that the holy disciple of St. Peter (viz. St. Mark, first Bishop of Alexandria) formed his decrees which he handed down to his successors, on any other rules than those which he derived from his master the Apostle. The original tradition of



Alexandria on the point in question must therefore (St. Leo argues) have been the same as that which St. Peter lodged in the Church of Rome. St. Leo therefore tells the Patriarch, "We do not allow that confessing ourselves to be of one body and faith, we should have any discrepancy, and that the institutions of the master (St. Peter) should be one, and those of the disciple (St. Mark) different." Accordingly he says he will send the presbyter Posidonius, who had often been present at the ordinations in Rome, to communicate to the Patriarch exactly how the ordinations should be conducted at Alexandria. Here, too, as in the statement of St. Clement, is the consciousness of possessing a living tradition, dating from St. Peter, which St. Leo calls the "paternal" tradition, concerning the government and practice of the Church, and which St. Clement calls a tradition, "fixed by the supreme will," *i.e.* the will of God. It is the same tone in St. Leo, the same idea, the same consciousness of possessing the one tradition of the Church's doctrine and Government, as appears in St. Clement's letter to the Corinthians four or five years before the close of the first century.

Now, contrast this first jet of history with the ideal of Bishop Overall, Bishop Stubbs, and the usual Anglican contention. Unity is supposed to have been secured at the 'Reformation' by the supremacy of the nation's will, according to Bishop Stubbs; by a certain hierarchical subordination under godly kings, according to Bishop Overall; by public consent, as the phrase is on the lips of so many. There is nothing of all this in the early history of the Church. It may be replied that it would be ludicrous to expect it. There was no such Christian king as Henry VIII. in the time of St. Clement. Corinth applied to Rome, as the only means then in existence for securing unity; or Rome intervened in Corinthian affairs, as was natural, when Corinth was torn to pieces. But even so, what does this mean but that there is no positive "primitive" basis for the Anglican position? What does it mean but that by the disposition of Divine Providence the Christian Church was to develop her resources for unity, without the possibility of reference to any civil power, and indeed, for the most part, under persecution? What but that the mainstay of unity, as a matter of fact, was in the beginning of her history, the Church of Rome? And Rome never, from her first utterance onwards, speaks as though she were merely a *dernier ressort* failing the existence of other apparatus in the future. St. Clement strikes the key-note of the whole future, and uses words which forbid the idea that the See was simply a natural centre owing to the position of the city. His language would be altogether unbecoming on this supposition. He speaks, as we have seen, as secure, in his judgment, of a

Divine assistance, and of their obligation to recognise the decision of the Church of Rome as the voice of the Holy Spirit. His contention is the same as appears in Tertullian's assertion in the second century, who distinguished the See of Rome from others, as that into which the Apostles Peter and Paul had "poured all their doctrine;" that is to say, it had a peculiar inheritance of Apostolical tradition, just as it claimed, according to the same witness, an inheritance of government. Its Pontiff corresponded in men's minds, according to Tertullian, to the Pontifex Maximus of the heathen religion.

Within, therefore, the first century of the Christian era unity was restored at Corinth by the action of Rome, writing a most powerful letter, and sending legates to the scene of disturbance; and, according to St. Ignatius, with special allusion (it is thought) to this letter, Rome was the teacher of others (*ἄλλους ἐδιδάξατε*, Ign. Ep. ad. Rom. § 3), words which, Bishop Lightfoot remarks, "the newly recovered ending of St. Clement's letter enables us to appreciate more fully." And St. Clement does not come before us as acting through ambition, but as discharging a responsibility. He is not, according to St. Irenæus, grasping at power, but gloriously establishing peace. Indeed, the idea of the Popes having determinedly grasped at power, which is the Anglican explanation of Rome's position, is ludicrously inconsistent with the whole history of the early Church. People write as though they imagined that the Popes were in earliest days great magnates in the centre of the Roman Empire, compassing the subjection of the Christian world. In point of fact, apart from the recognition of their office as supreme Pastors on the part of the faithful throughout the world, they were doomed to simple insignificance. They governed a handful of converts, living, as we have said, mostly in the wretched haunts of the Suburra, the most degraded part of the city—Jews and Greeks by origin. Here and there they had a disciple in court; but they were living under emperors like Diocletian, and had to keep their conversion a secret. And yet from the first the Popes speak like St. Clement and St. Victor, to their fellow-Christians, as burdened with world-wide responsibilities, and responsibilities such as could not accrue to them from a merely natural position. St. Victor's attitude would have been impossible on this supposition, and St. Clement's language would have been turgid and bombastic, indeed arrogant and presumptuous. And the actual extent of resort to Rome would have been morally impossible, if it had been merely a matter of utility to consult it. Christians were not the kind of people that could travel to Rome as people 'come up' to London. Yet they came, or sent, to Rome. They had recourse to Rome in spite of circumstances which were naturally prohibitive. For,

wherever a Christian community existed, it existed in the presence of a watchful foe. Centralisation was not natural under such circumstances, but rather (had there been no other reason than mutual self-defence) a prudent abstinence from manifesting their polity as a kingdom. In point of fact, a large measure of autonomy was a necessity of the case, and must have developed into general 'episcopal independence,' but for a counteracting principle, which lay at the root of the Christian polity. The provinces of Christendom (so to call them by anticipation) were not only separated by distance and the difficulties of travel, but were watched by the sleepless jealousy of a hostile world. And the implacable antagonism of the Empire bore with special weight on the Bishop of Rome himself. The continuance of that See at all is a miracle of persistency. Its perpetual watchfulness from the earliest times over the interests, spiritual and temporal, of outlying nations is another miracle. And the continual resort to the Holy See under the tremendous hatred that dogged its action is a third miracle, *unless* we take into account the words of our Lord to St. Peter, and the ineradicable conviction of the faithful that it was set by Divine appointment as the centre of their religion. This perpetual recourse to Rome is only to be rationally explained by the Catholic interpretation of St. Irenæus's language on the subject. From his words we see that Christians would not simply repair to Rome as a matter of accident, as to the world's great centre and mart, though that was doubtless a reason in the Providence of God for selecting Rome as the metropolis of the Kingdom of Christ. St. Irenæus gives another reason. "It is necessary," he says, "that all *Churches* should agree with this *Church*" of Rome. And the reason of this necessity is given distinctly; it is "by reason of the more powerful supremacy" of the Church (not of the city) of Rome. This is the way in which, according to St. Irenæus, the faithful can be the most assured of the correctness of their belief. The context of St. Irenæus's words absolutely precludes the interpretation of the Protestant writer Langen, adopted by Mr. Gore,\* that the preservation of the faith at Rome was due to the concourse of faithful who gravitated thither from all parts. St. Irenæus is dealing with the security to the faith that arises from the Apostolic succession, *i.e.*, from Churches being able to trace themselves up to an Apostle. Wherever a Church could thus trace itself to an Apostle, and could be sure that it was maintaining the tradition given by that Apostle (the Apostles being each of them infallible in their tradition of the deposit), it might rest assured that it had the true faith. But the palmary instance

---

\* "Roman Catholic Claims," p. 92, *note*.

of this security is, says St. Irenæus, afforded by Rome, which supplies the form to all Churches, with which all other Churches *must agree*, and why? Because, as Mr. Gore says, there was in Rome such ample opportunity of comparing traditions, and eliminating what was purely local? No; St. Irenæus gives the reason, and it is not what Mr. Gore, following Dr. Langen, assigns. St. Irenæus says the necessity arises from Rome's relation of supremacy—*ob potentiorē principalitē*—a word used elsewhere by the Saint of the dominion of God. And the Church of Rome is that Church, "in communion with which (as the expression '*in quā*' is best interpreted) the tradition from the Apostles has been always preserved by men from all parts." Mr. Gore's interpretation is simply an inversion of the Saint's teaching as to the relation of Rome to the rest of Christendom. The ground of the "commanding supremacy" of the Church of Rome is not given by St. Ignatius; that was sufficiently known to instructed Christians. It was not, however, the concourse of the faithful thither, and the consequent comparison of traditions, for these were secure "in communion with her" (*in quā*), not an element of security to her.

The idea, then, of the successive occupants of the Holy See setting themselves to develop a programme of usurpation under the circumstances, or of their uniformly catching the infection of ambitious schemes from their mere occupancy of the See, is preposterously unphilosophical. Yet they are, one and all, possessed from the hour of their consecration with the consciousness that they are the guardians of the Apostolic deposit for the whole Christian body. Their "*potentior principalitas*" with its onerous duties, is never absent from their minds, and is the most salient feature in their letters and actions. Each occupant brings with him into the sacred office this uniform sense of responsibility, as attaching to his See, and alludes to it as part of the universal consciousness of Christendom; and from the moment they sit upon the Fisherman's Throne, they act without hesitation, as entrusted with the care of all the Churches. It is said that the first words after election of one of the few Popes who disgraced the *tiara*, were, "I am the Vicar of Christ." This was certainly the burden of the thoughts of the long line of Saints and Martyrs who occupied the Fisherman's Throne.

They were seldom sure of life from month to month; but they never ceased to govern, and to govern on that understanding.

St. Clement's letter was written in the first breathing time that the Church enjoyed in the persecutions under Domitian. Whilst St. Stephen was insisting, now on the gate of remission being open to post-baptismal sin, and now on the reality of Baptism when administered even by heretics (involving even a

contest with the great Cyprian), he was in continual danger of his life, and ended with winning the martyr's-crown. Throughout those centuries the Popes exercised their jurisdiction mostly at the risk, often at the cost, of their lives; but they did not cease to exercise it. They could not have exercised it over an unwilling people. Think of their position. The heathen State proscribed Christian worship, doctrine, manner of life, and stigmatised as un-Roman their withdrawal from secular employments. But that they should have one to whom they looked up as their chief Bishop could not but be a matter of intense dislike to the civil power. St. Cyprian tells us how Decius said that he would rather have a rival Emperor in Rome than another Bishop. Fabian, the last Bishop, had ordained Bishops for seven provinces in Gaul, increased the number of Presbyters in Rome, and, in the exercise of discipline, issued a letter against a criminal Bishop, which was his final offence. He was executed by the Emperor's order, and for eighteen months the See remained vacant. At the end of that time, Cornelius, from one of the noblest families in Rome, was elected to what St. Cyprian calls "the place of Peter," and shortly afterwards was banished by the Emperor, and martyred. The next Pope, within five months, shared his fate. Nevertheless they continued to exercise their jurisdiction. The next Pope, Stephen, whom we have already mentioned, maintained, according to his contemporary, St. Dionysius of Alexandria, the ancient renown of his chair in providing for the spiritual and temporal wants of the furthest Churches. At the instance of St. Cyprian, he brought back peace to the Church of Arles, by deposing the schismatical Bishop Marcian. Appealing (as we know from his opponent Firmilian) to his descent from Peter—holding (as Firmilian notes) "the first place"—he maintained the Roman tradition as to baptism against the resistance of the Bishops in Asia Minor and Africa. After four years he, too, died a martyr in 257. On the 6th of August his successor, Xystus II., followed him to his reward.\* A troop of heathen soldiers seized him as he was offering the holy sacrifice in the catacomb of Prætextatus, and beheaded him in his Episcopal chair. This series of martyrdoms fills a single decade only in the Church's life. There can be no question here of grasping at power. These martyrs, one and all, evinced a profound consciousness of possessing an heirloom of tradition, for the maintenance of which they knew themselves to be responsible at the bar of God, and which supplied the basis of the whole Church's faith and discipline. How could they pose in those days of fiery persecution, as inheritors of a Divine tradition,

\* See "Throne of the Fisherman," p. 83.

peculiarly theirs to guard for the whole Church, without making themselves ludicrous and contemptible, unless their claim were reflected in the general consciousness of the Church? Yet the Church crowned them with the aureole of a martyr's privileges, offered the Holy Sacrifice on their tomb, and sought their intercession at the Throne of Grace. The idea of usurpation, we repeat, is preposterously incompatible with the surroundings in which it is supposed to occur.

Xystus II. was followed by St. Dionysius, whose charity, as well as his vigilance, extended over the whole Christian world.

There is an incident in the life of St. Dionysius which gives us such an important glimpse into the life of the Church in the third century, that it will be worth our while to enter into it somewhat in detail.

It shows us in what the government of St. Peter's See over the East consisted at that time. No one supposes that the Holy See intervened, or could, in the nature of things, have often intervened directly at such a time in the affairs of the various provinces throughout the world. We know from St. Jerome later on that it acted, by *occasional* intervention, well-nigh throughout the known world. But considering the nature of intercommunication in those times this could be *only* occasional. What actually happened was this. The 'keys' were originally given to St. Peter, but the College of Apostles was associated with him, each of them with immediate universal jurisdiction from our Lord, and each of them secure of Divine assistance in promulgating the faith. They went out into the wide world and founded Sees, without occupying them themselves, excepting St. Peter and St. James. Being, each of them, confirmed in grace and infallible, the position of subordination which they occupied in regard to St. Peter was never emphasised as is the case where there is opposition or rebellion. They left to the Church which they founded the deposit of truth which they bore with them from Jerusalem. They had no successors in their Apostolate. The Apostolate, which, nevertheless, was of the essence of the government of the Church, remained with one See, whose first Bishop was himself the Prince of the Apostles. This soon came to be called *the* Apostolic See, in a unique sense. It was such to St. Augustine, and, as such, its dogmatic decisions on matters of faith were to a true Christian conclusive. That this was St. Augustine's belief is capable of rigorous proof.

Whilst, therefore, the Apostles, as a rule, left no successors of their infallibility and universal jurisdiction, there was one exception. It was not St. James, whose See occupied at the Council of Nice quite a subordinate position. It was St. Peter. The Apostles left Bishops to succeed them in some respects, and to



hand on the deposit of truth, which they bequeathed to the various Churches they founded. These Bishops, scattered through the world, enjoyed a large measure of autonomy, not, however, on principle, but of necessity. It was reluctantly on their part that they were in any measure externally separated, and not from any idea of the value of 'Episcopal independence.' Africa, for instance, was in constant communication with Rome, and in a state of constant appeal, even at the time when some of the Bishops were pleading for a court of first instance which would diminish their attendance at Rome. And throughout the world, however autonomous from the stress of circumstances distant provinces remained, intercommunication was kept up by *Epistolæ formatæ*, or letters of communion, between all parts of the Christian world. Not to be within the circle of Christian life embraced by these *literæ formatæ*, was equivalent to being no longer within the Christian Church. But when through the withdrawal of the *χάρισμα* of infallibility which the Apostles each enjoyed, any doubt arose as to whether a Bishop was handing on with accurate fidelity the deposit of truth communicated by the Apostolic founder of a Church, or cluster of Churches, then St. Irenæus's rule came into force. The natural thing was at once to compare the tradition being promulgated with that of the nearest Apostolic Church, and finally, if need arose (or at once, if opportunity occurred, or the occasion called for it) with the Church of Rome, with which it was necessary to agree, says St. Irenæus: *ob potentio rem principalitatem*, because of her powerful supremacy as compared with all the rest. And as the lapse of time separated men from the days of the Apostles, they looked more and more to the permanent Apostle of the Christian Church, the one predestined seat of infallibility and universal jurisdiction. St. Clement of Alexandria calls St. Clement of Rome, "The Apostle Clement." And such the occupant of the See of Rome was to St. Augustine—not as confirmed in grace, nor possessing inspiration, but as secured from error by special Divine assistance. The amount, therefore, of the intervention of the Holy See in the affairs of the Church might be expected to increase with the growth of the Church. Nothing in the history of the Church up to this hour has gone beyond the principle involved in St. Clement's letter to the Church at Corinth. Only the principle has expanded itself with the expansion of the Church. And the measure of autonomy forced upon the scattered communities of the early Church during the days of persecution would naturally give way to increasing centralisation, as the possibilities of exhibiting her law of unity increased. Meanwhile that external unity, which is a note of the Church, was being matured in the circles of Christian communities which

were nearer to the centre of unity. The Bishop of Rome, and his Council of Bishops, formed the first and central knot. But from the first there was a wider circle embracing a large portion of the East, distinctly gathered round this centre of unity. Three great Sees appear in the early Church, each of them placing St. Peter at the head of their catalogue of Bishops. Each of them was a See of St. Peter. Their history is given by St. Boniface, St. Leo, and St. Gregory. St. Peter himself resided temporarily at Antioch, and sent his disciple, St. Mark, to Alexandria, and lived and died at Rome. These two Sees, therefore, occupied quite a unique position in Christian history. They were, with the See of Rome, the three measures of meal which the woman took and leavened the whole, as St. Gregory says. They appear at Nice, with their prerogatives already in full exercise, and these prerogatives, left untouched, are called by the Council of Nice 'ancient.' Clearly, therefore, the idea of episcopal independence was no portion of the teaching of the Primitive Church, unless we can show that those two commanding Sees of Antioch and Alexandria, with their immense provinces of subordinate Sees, were independent of Rome. But precisely the contrary can be shown. They did not place St. Peter at the head of their Episcopal succession in a spirit of rivalry with Rome. On the contrary, it was a link of unity. And the incident in the life of St. Dionysius, which we have prefaced with these remarks, shows that the unity was that of subordination—equality of honour in the possession of the *sacerdotium*, but subordination in the matter of guidance and rule.

And when Antioch separates from Rome, and Alexandria is occupied by a bishop not in communion with Rome, the one is under the baneful influence of a Court, and each are tainted with deadly heresy. The account of the incident to which we have referred in connection with St. Dionysius is given by St. Athanasius, himself Patriarch of Alexandria. The case was as follows :

In the latter half of the third century the Sabellian heresy had sprung up in the region of Pentapolis, which, as we know from the sixth Nicene Canon in the next century, belonged to the "Greater Metropolitanate" (or, as it was afterwards called, 'the Patriarchate') of Alexandria. The Patriarch bearing the same name as the Pope, viz., Dionysius, at once wrote to the Pope to inform him of the fact that this heresy had emerged under his rule.\* And at the same time he wrote letters to two of the Egyptian bishops. In his letters to these bishops he laid great stress on the reality of our Lord's humanity. This

\* On a previous occasion St. Dionysius wrote to Pope Xystus, giving as his reason for writing, "that I may not err." Cf. Eus. Eccl. Hist. L. vii. 9.

caused some of his Presbyters to suspect him of leaning towards the Arian heresy. And afterwards the Arians quoted him on their side. St. Athanasius, in a graphic account of the whole matter, indignantly repudiates the accusation thus levelled against his saintly predecessor. He tells them, in a magnificent letter, exactly what happened. The Alexandrian Presbyters, in their zeal for orthodoxy, reported their Patriarch to the Bishop of Rome, who at once wrote a letter on the subject of Sabellianism and Arianism, adjusting the balance of truth which these opposite heresies variously disturbed. He also wrote to the Patriarch of Alexandria for him to explain what exactly it was for which he was accused, as the Presbyters not having explained it, he was in the dark. St. Dionysius at once sent on a letter to the Pope, with another to follow, that the Pope might not think him dilatory in clearing himself from the accusation, however vague. His reply was sufficient. And St. Athanasius tells the Arians that they have only succeeded in forging a weapon against themselves in quoting St. Dionysius of Alexandria in their favour. "For [he says] they had brought two things into prominence: first, that St. Dionysius of Alexandria having cleared himself, they have him against them; and secondly, that the fact of St. Dionysius the Pope having written, as he did, against those who say that the Son of God is a creature, shows that not now (in St. Athanasius's time) for the first time, but long ago (*ἐκπαλαι*) their heresy had been "anathematized by all." Here, then, is the principle of appeal at work from a Patriarch to the Bishop of Rome; here is an instance of the unvarying orthodoxy of the occupants of the Holy See; and an instance of how they governed the Church on the subject of the Homocousion long years before the Council of Nice.

Now, all this is incompatible with the Anglican theory of jurisdiction and ecclesiastical unity, even upon the theory of development. Admit development, and it *may be said* that Christian nationalities had not yet arisen, and *therefore* the home of the various centres of jurisdiction had not yet been fixed—that the idea of national independent Churches could not be formulated as yet. But this is the renunciation of the most fundamental point of the Anglican contention, viz., that what is not Primitive is not Catholic—and primitive not after the manner of the germ, which exhibits as it grows unexpected integrations (to use the language of evolution) out of successive differentiations—but primitive in the sense of being posited in actual reality in the earliest days, so that the true form of ecclesiastical unity must be faithfully and realistically mirrored in the first four centuries of the Christian Church. If once the Anglican betakes himself to the theory of development, he has broken with the principle on which

he has of late years opposed the Catholic Church. But even on any rational theory of development the position is untenable, in view of what we have already seen in the history of the early Church. The Catholic is there, *at least* in germ; the Anglican is not there at all. Yet no assertion has been more vigorously pressed of late years than the supposed unprimitive character of the Catholic claims. "You are not primitive; it is enough for me. We can do without what the Primitive Church lacked. She had no Pope to guide her; we, too, need no Pope." Such is the continual cry of the Anglican, who calls himself a Catholic. It is as well, therefore, to point out that anyhow the Anglican cannot build his own theory on the ground of Primitivity. He cannot occupy the ground himself. And unless he can do so, his theory halts. He cannot oppose us, as being himself primitive. This is what results plainly from the glimpses of the Church's life which we catch in ante-Nicene times. They none of them smile on the Anglican position. Whatever else they suggest as possible in a continuous and developing future, they do not suggest, they cannot be made to square with, that—supposing, for the sake of argument, that the Anglican Episcopate can make good its claim to valid orders. St. Clement's attitude towards Corinth, St. Victor's practical assertion that to be within the "common unity" of which he speaks, you must be in communion with Rome; St. Stephen's claim to act as the successor of St. Peter, St. Dionysius calling upon the Patriarch of Alexandria to explain the accusation brought against him—these are historical incidents within the first three centuries which imply an idea of government which it was not left to St. Leo in the fifth century, nor St. Gregory in the sixth, to initiate. The Papal form of unity is already there, with resources to be developed according to the growing needs of the Church.

All these facts are bound to put the Anglican on his defence. And what is his reply? It is always the same in substance, and it is twofold:—(1) that on each recorded occasion of the exercise of Papal authority, some resistance is offered to the claim, and that such resistance invalidates the claim; and (2) that so far as the claim was conceded, it was on the ground of Rome's natural position.

But we remark (1) that in each case there was at least eventual submission. In each case, too, the particular exercise of authority was alone questioned, if questioned at all, and not the authority itself. Corinth submits to Rome; St. Irenæus does not question St. Victor's authority in itself. St. Cyprian (according to St. Augustine) submits to St. Stephen; St. Dionysius of Alexandria submits his explanation to St. Dionysius of Rome.

Again (2) it is not, as a matter of fact, the natural position of

Rome that comes to the front. Rome, in St. Clement's letter, claims Corinth's submission on the ground of a certain infallibility attaching to her judgment; it is, she says, the voice of the Holy Spirit. Tertullian witnesses that already, in his day, Rome and St. Peter were connected in men's minds. St. Cyprian calls the place of Fabian the place of Peter. St. Stephen speaks of himself as the successor of Peter.

The Papal claim, therefore, is in possession in those first three centuries; and it requires more to dislodge it than an occasional ineffectual murmur; and is it conceivable that St. Athanasius, having before him all that Julius had said by that time of his relation to St. Peter, should have spoken as he did of St. Dionysius's dealing with the Patriarch of Alexandria, had he possessed in his mind the tiniest germ of the Anglican theory, as to Rome's Primacy being due simply to the greatness of the city? The authority of the Bishop of Rome had at least by this time been definitely connected with the name of St. Peter, and the claim was now precise to an heirloom of tradition, unique, priceless, capable of pouring out its treasures according to need, and secure of Divine assistance in its enunciations of the principles of order, and the original deposit of truth. Yet St. Athanasius has no word of protest, but only praises St. Dionysius and St. Julius, and he signs the canons of the Sardican Council.

The name of St. Athanasius brings us to the Council of Nicæa.

But before passing on to that Council, we would insist upon the importance of the fact that in each recorded instance of intervention on the part of the Holy See in the affairs of the Church, the judgment of the Supreme Pontiff has received, sooner or later, the adhesion of the entire Church. Pope St. Clement's Epistle to Corinth was read in churches side by side with Holy Scripture. St. Victor did his best to prevent any growing tendency to a lasting difference (and who can say what would have been the loss to the Church had the difference increased?) as to the time of celebrating the Queen of Festivals; and after having shown first his desire to obtain uniformity on so important a matter (though not a matter of faith), and then his willingness in deference to St. Irenæus's intercession, to bide his time, and humour the attachment to local customs as urged by St. Polycarp, his judgment received the adhesion of the entire body of Bishops at the Council of Nice. The martyrs of Lyons from their dungeons appeal to Pope Eleutherus to oppose the authority of his office to the progress of Montanism, and Tertullian (himself involved in the heresy) records bitterly: "I hear that an edict has been published, and indeed a peremptory one, namely, 'the Bishop of Bishops, which is equivalent to the 'Sovereign Pontiff,' proclaims, 'I pardon sins . . . to such as have

"performed penance. This is read in the Church, and proclaimed in the Church." No need to say that the Church adhered to the "Sovereign Pontiff," and not to Tertullian.

Again, the whole future action of the Church towards heretics was endangered by the determined effort on the part of St. Cyprian and Firmilian and others, backed by the decisions of large Provincial Councils, to rebaptise heretics unconditionally. Nothing but the firm opposition of competent authority could have stemmed the stream which was setting in against the real Apostolical tradition. But the Pope was at the helm, and in spite of the tremendous waves of opposition he held his own, and interpreted the Apostolical tradition, which had been wrongly rendered by St. Cyprian and the Asiatic provinces.

Hear St. Vincent of Lerins on the matter, "Pope Stephen, of blessed memory, who at that time was prelate of the Apostolic See, resisted, in conjunction indeed with his colleagues, yet more than his colleagues, thinking it fit, as I suppose, that he should surpass all others in the devotedness of his faith, as much as he excelled them by the authority of his station." And the sentence of the Pope is the teaching of the Church at this hour.

The Donatists appealed to the Emperor to settle their dispute, making the Crown a Court of Appeal. The Emperor, not yet Arianised and Erastianised by Eusebius, referred them to the Pope. The Pope (St. Melchiades) associates with himself a number of Italian Bishops in conjunction with three of the African Bishops (thereby exhibiting the same spirit as St. Cyprian did in the management of the Diocese in conjunction with the Presbyters), and delivers a sentence for which he is justly praised by St. Augustine. "How admirable," exclaims the Saint in after years, "was the final sentence of Melchiades!" (Ep. xliii.). The sentence was further emphasised and promoted by a Council of Bishops,\* in which the Papal Legates sat, not as in a Court of Appeal, for Judges appealed against do not sit in the appeal, but by way of enforcing what St. Augustine calls the final sentence of the Pope, and the decrees of the Council were sent to the Pope for him to communicate "to all men;" the centre of unity to the circumference of the Church's dominion.

This brings us within ten years of the Council of Nice. What kind of witness is borne by the history of that Council to the relation of the Pope to the Church? How does it bear on the Anglican claim to represent historical Christianity?

The Council's doctrinal decision had been anticipated by Pope Dionysius in the previous century, as St. Athanasius triumph-

---

\* "Not (says St. Augustine) because this was necessary, but as a concession to their perversity, and wishing to use every means for restraining their shamelessness." Ep. 43, n. 20.



antly insists against the Arians ; and the contrary heresy had, as he pointed out in his letter concerning Dionysius of Alexandria, been "long ago" anathematised by Rome, and so, "by all." What, therefore, was needed was an echo of the Papal judgment, a repetition in the most emphatic mode of utterance, a declaration that Arius and his followers did not belong to the Church, and that the world of Bishops held with the teaching which had been ever maintained at Rome, of which the foremost champion at this moment was Alexander, Bishop of Alexandria, with whose diocese Arius was himself connected.

With Constantine the one thought, doubtless, was unity at whatever price. With St. Sylvester, as he sent his Legates charged with instructions, and commissioned Hosius with them to represent himself, the one thought would be that the true teaching, upheld by himself and Alexander, should obtain world-wide recognition, and the Church would be bound together in that truth, as she extruded from her pale the leader of the opposite heresy. The Council would perform the function of witnessing to the dogmatic truth thus long previously enforced by the Pope and championed now at Alexandria. It would add the solemn circumstance of the assembled Church uttering the same judgment as its head had long ago pronounced—manifesting and securing unity by the imposing spectacle of a vast array of Eastern Bishops passing judgment in accordance with the uniform teaching of the Holy See, as to the very foundation-truth of the Church's teaching. We say an array of Eastern Bishops—for the Western Bishops could be counted on a man's hand. The Nicene Council, in spite of Eusebius' glowing description (which, from his semi-Arian propensities, he substitutes for the narrative of facts that he might have given us), was not a representative assembly in the sense of containing bishops from all parts of the world. Five Western Bishops out of the 318 could hardly be called a representation, except on the supposition that there was something peculiar in the Sees represented. A diocese in Spain could not represent even the province from which its bishop came, unless by special arrangement. But Bishop Hosius did not sign, like the rest of the bishops, as representing even the Spanish province from which he came. Anglicans quite fail to give its due importance to this fact, that the Council of Nice, apart from its confirmation by the Pope, was mainly Eastern. The only reasonable explanation of its ecumenicity lies in the Papal confirmation.

The official records have perished ; but what remains bears most significantly upon the nature of the Church's government. What most strikes one at once about the Nicene Council is the witness it bears to the irrepressible vigour with which the Church

had developed her form of unity. She there emerges from her throes, after three centuries of outlawry and persecution, with an organisation, world-wide in its extension, and unquestioned in its main principle, although lately questioned in one particular application of that principle. The principle is, that her Episcopate is her teaching body, and that rank and subordination amongst bishops is part of the Church's order. In other words, the Church appears before us as the waters of persecution suddenly abate, with a government already formed, a government not merely by bishops, but by a *hierarchy* of bishops. The Council originates nothing in this respect. It simply gives in its adhesion to a principle already in working order. It not only sets its seal on the principle, but proclaims its submission to the particular application of the principle then in question, as to the Egyptian Sees, as a matter of *ancient rule*. "Let the ancient customs hold their place" is the opening of its Canon on this subject. The Council does not place itself above these ancient customs, but is governed by them. Three Sees are mentioned as already in authority, in that important sixth Canon. They are, as a matter of fact, the three Sees of Peter. In the jurisdiction of one of these Petrine Sees a quarrel had recently arisen, and Meletius, an Egyptian Bishop, who had been deposed by the Bishop of Alexandria and formed a schism, is practically condemned; and the Bishops of the Council adhere to the jurisdictional extent of the See of Alexandria, as it had been mapped out *in the past* with the cognisance of the Bishop of Rome. The Church, therefore, suddenly comes before us with the stamp of a regulated visible unity. The Church, as seen at Nicæa, is one kingdom, one single body, numerically and visibly one. She is not, as Bishop Overall conceived the matter, a number of national units, bound together by no necessary external signs of amity. She is not, as Dr. Pusey imagined (carrying on Bishop Overall's theory), a number of independent Provinces, united through their own isolated union, with her Divine Head. The Church at Nicæa is already a compact unity, bound together by certain ties of hierarchical interdependence—ties formed by ecclesiastical arrangement, but still such that, to break away from them, when duly rivetted, is, as in the case of the Egyptian Bishops, to break away from the Church, and incur the guilt of schism. Her various parts are bound together by relations which, so far as the Nicene Canon goes in the way of indication, are lost in the dimness of antiquity. But this dimness is relieved by the glimpses of light which we have already caught of the Church's previous life, and by the history of the Church as given to us by St. Boniface and others in the next century. "The government (says St. Boniface) of the Universal Church,

"at its commencement, derived its origin from the dignity of the "blessed Peter, in whom its rule and management abide" (Ep. xiv.). And so, as we shall see, the Fathers of Nicæa say in respect to this government of the Church, "Let the ancient customs keep their place." The various provinces of the Church had already lived in active intercommunion, bound together by an hierarchical order, the main feature of which was the position occupied by the Petrine Sees, a kind of Triumvirate in the government of the Church. What with the frequent Synods within the area of each province, and the constant interchange of *literæ formatae*, or letters of communion, between the members of the various Provinces, and the occasional communication between the rulers of the greater Sees, all centering in Rome, as a matter of fact, and again, the emergence of St. Peter's name in special connection with that See—the picture of the Church's visible unity may be said to have been already drawn by the records which have come down to us from those times. Direct and indirect notices, longer and plainer records, scraps and fragments which have survived the frequent shipwrecks of historical treasures, all combine to produce one harmonious picture. What we have is sufficient for our purpose, and it is of one jet.

The Anglican idea that the Council commended itself to the mind of the Church diffusive, and so secured its authority, an idea which is prominent in 'Janus,' is absolutely devoid of foundation in fact. This theory supposes that the Council was never "received" *on authority*, but only in virtue of individual confirmation. It is difficult indeed to see how, on the Anglican idea of the ecumenicity of a Council, there could be any authoritative teaching in the Church at all. Not even a Council, confirmed by the Pope, comes before the world as an infallible statement of truth; it must wait, on this theory, for its authentication by the body of the faithful at large, who thus become the ultimate authority in the teaching of the Church.

Certainly this is not what history evidences as to the estimate of the Council of Nice in the fourth century. There was resistance to it, and in abundance; sufficient indeed, if we were to accept the principle which Mr. Gore and others adopt, in reference to the validity of the Papal claims, to invalidate the claim of the Nicene faith to be the teaching of the Church. For the rest of the century the Pope is mainly occupied in enforcing the authoritative sentence of the Council on recalcitrant Bishops. But he does not plead the reception of the Conciliar utterance by the faithful, but the authority attaching to its utterance itself, which was not a separate thing from his own judgment, but one decision.

But why, it may be asked, not simply plead the authority of

the Holy See? To which the answer is plain, that the Arians had already repudiated that, as they were prepared presently to repudiate also the authority of the Council. Hosius' mission to Alexandria had failed. But for Constantine, and for others, no more effective weapon could be handled than the demonstration that the head and the body were one. The decree of the head, to the instructed faithful, would be amply sufficient. Arius had been already held as a heretic; but the decision of the head in conjunction with the "conjudication" of the associated teaching body, viz., the Episcopate, was a stronger argument still to any one who was inclined to resistance. It was more imposing, required less faith, and was more suited for Constantine's purposes than the issue of a decree on the part of the Apostolic See. So that the object of the Holy See in advising a Council was to manifest the faith of the entire Church; to exhibit her real unity. These considerations are mentioned merely as showing that nothing in the mere fact of holding a Council at this crisis militates against the infallibility of the Holy See. Those who are afterwards known as the Eusebians were not prepared to accept the judgment of Holy See or Sacred Council; but Constantine was prepared to enforce the judgment of the two, *i.e.*, of the whole Church. It would have been perfectly absurd to expect him to issue an edict at that crisis, such as the three Emperors afterwards imposed on the Empire, saying, "It is our will that all the peoples who are governed by our clemency hold the religion which is proved to have been delivered to the Romans by the Divine Apostle Peter." The East was overrun with Arianism, and the all-important point from the Imperial view was to exhibit the great body of the Episcopate in unison on whichever side. The Emperor recognised in the Church a single Kingdom with a complete organisation of its own, and was prepared to enforce the teaching of that Kingdom on all who professed the Christian name. The Bishops had met in Synods, and the Church, diffusive in conjunction with her head, infallible in her teaching in diffusion, though not in separation, had taught the doctrine of her Lord's Divinity. Rome and Alexandria had imposed the very term *Homoousion* on the faithful. It was now to be seen in the face of day that there was no place in the Church for any who taught the contrary. The Bishops in the exercise of their peculiar prerogative, by the grace of their consecration, were now to proclaim before the world their universal adherence to what as a matter of fact had been the teaching of the Holy See, and of such Bishops as Alexander of Alexandria. They did not come to decide an open question, but to let the Emperor know that there was but one teaching in East and West, in the head

and body alike, and that that teaching assigned proper Divinity to the Invisible Head of the Church.

The Western Bishops did not attend the Council, with the exception of five. There was no need for them to do so. It was enough for them that the Legates of the Holy See were there. A Council confirmed by the Primate of the Universal Church, who was the informing power of the Church's inerrancy, would be a sufficient authority for any who held the Christian Faith, and their own presence could add nothing to its infallibility. It is not possible to prove the ecumenical character of the Council of Nicæa on any other supposition. For its decrees, as we have said, did not acquire their binding value by reason of their subsequent reception by the Church, which is the Anglican theory, but, on the contrary, they were received by the Church at large, because of their binding character from the first. Constantine enforced them as such at once.

The Council was convoked by the Emperor in concert with the Pope, by the advice of the latter. This is expressly stated by the sixth General Council, which was composed entirely of Eastern Bishops. With this agrees the statement of Rufinus, who says that the Council was called "*ex sacerdotum sententia*"—in consequence of the opinion of the Bishops, as 'sacerdotes' generally meant in early writings. That it would not have been the suggestion of Eusebius and the rest of the Arianising Bishops who surrounded the Emperor, is evident. They would have been the last to suggest or look favourably upon it. But we know that letters were just then passing between Rome and Alexandria on the general crisis; and we may fairly assume that the subject of a Council would be amongst their topics. But the words of the Papal Legate at Chalcedon, forbidding Dioscorus to sit in the Council, prove that St. Sylvester gave his authoritative sanction, if he did not, as is likely, originate the idea of a Council. Dioscorus was condemned for having "dared to hold a Synod without the authority of the Apostolic See, which has never been lawful, and has never been done;" words which, considering their reception by the Easterns, exhibit the general conviction as to the authority by which the great Council of Nicæa had been held.

The Council thus convoked was considered to be under the direction of the Holy See, which presided over it by its Legates.

It is explicitly stated in the same century by Damasus and a Synod of 90 bishops that the 318 bishops of Nicæa were "directed from the city of the most holy Bishop of Rome" in their work of the Council. The Pope presided by his Legates, consisting of a Bishop and two Priests. The two Priests, who had no right

to a place in the Council, except in their capacity as Legates, state the fact in their subscription, and Bishop Hosius signs, not in the place of his Province, as the rest, but first. He clearly signed, not as representing any Province, but as Legate. These three sign before even the Bishop of Alexandria. There is, however, another singular witness to the fact that St. Sylvester, the Pope, was universally considered to have presided over the Council—a witness that must be considered altogether unimpeachable by the most suspicious Anglican—viz., the Græco-Russian Liturgy. In the office of St. Sylvester occurs the following text in allusion to the Council of Nicæa: "Thou hast shown thyself the supreme one of the Sacred Council, O initiator into the sacred mysteries, and hast illustrated the throne of the supreme one of the disciples." Here is the Presidency of the Council attributed, as an established fact, to St. Sylvester; and it is connected with the traditional belief as to the supremacy of St. Peter among the Apostles. There is, too, no reason for pouring scorn on Gelasius, as Mr. Gore\* does, in his witness to the same effect. He is, in this instance, however he may fail in accuracy in some cases, evidently drawing his information from trustworthy sources, which he mentions,† and from which it appears that Hosius and the two Roman priests were bracketed as Legates of the Holy See, and presidents of the Council. Eusebius speaks of the Presidents in the plural number; and Photius, before his fall, joins Hosius and the priests together as the Papal Legation, following Gelasius.

The Papal confirmation of the Decree is expressly stated by the Council of Rome in A.D. 485, which says that the 318 bishops assembled at Nice "referred the confirmation of things and the authority to the Holy Roman Church" (Hard. ii. p. 856).

The sixth Canon of the Council, moreover, points to the shape which the hierarchy of the Church had long ago assumed. In this Canon, the most marked distinction is drawn between the position of Rome, on the one hand, and the great See of Alexandria and Antioch, the lesser Petrine Sees, on the other. Rome's cognisance, or Rome's example, whichever be the true interpretation, is quoted as determining the question of Alexandria's rights of jurisdiction. If the expression which the Nicene Fathers use in this sixth canon, in deciding in favour of the authority of Alexandria over Egypt, Libya, and Pentapolis—viz., "Since this is customary also with the Bishop of Rome"—if this means that such exercise of authority over other bishops was the custom also with the Bishop of Rome, then Rome's

---

\* "Roman Catholic Claims," p. 96, 1st ed.

† See Jungmann, "Diss. in Hist. Eccl.," D.V.



patriarchal sway is held up as the norm, and sufficient justification, of a similar authority on the part of the Bishop of Alexandria. The Council does not touch upon the ground of Rome's exercise of authority. That did not come within its purview. It spoke of her patriarchal sway as settled, and as settling their own question. It must be remembered that Rome has to this day both the title of patriarch and the duties of a patriarch towards a certain area of the Church (including England), as she has purely episcopal duties towards a still more limited area. Over and above these patriarchal and episcopal rights and duties, is her sway over the entire Church, which does not obliterate these special relations to the West as Patriarch, and to Rome as Bishop. The words of the Nicene Canon, then, if they refer to the patriarchal rights of Rome, show that the Nicene Fathers give in their adhesion to the long-established arrangement of a special jurisdiction over Egypt, Libya, and Pentapolis, as residing in the See of Alexandria, *on the ground (ἐπειδὴ) that Rome had thus organised her own minor\* jurisdiction; and Rome's action, it is assumed, is the true norm of the ecclesiastical government.* The Council does not confirm anything, but follows suit; it deals with Antioch and Alexandria, but only to declare the law which Rome had given by her action in her own neighbourhood. The Primal relations of Rome are something quite distinct, implied, indeed, by quoting her action as deciding the form of ecclesiastical government, but not touched upon directly in this Canon.

This interpretation, however, of the sixth Canon is not the only one that the words will bear. The Canon does not say anything about a *similar* exercise of jurisdiction as customary to the Bishop of Rome, so far as the letter of the Greek is concerned. It says "since *this* is customary to the Bishop of Rome." What is '*this*'? Taking the words simply as they stand, the Canon asserts that the subjection of the Egyptian Bishop and others to Alexandria is customary with the Bishop of Rome. Does not this mean that the jurisdiction of Alexandria over these same bishops had been the arrangement with respect to them, recognised and acted upon by the Bishop of Rome, and that consequently things should remain as they are? "Let the ancient customs hold their place." The arrangement concerning the jurisdiction of Alexandria had been made in ancient times with the cognisance of the Bishop of Rome. We can hardly doubt that the Pope had instructed his Legates on this question. The Bishops of Rome, they knew, had long ago originated, or allowed, or arranged the question of Alexandria's jurisdiction,

---

\* Minor, as compared with her jurisdiction over the whole Church.

and the present Pope had doubtless instructed his Legates to bring this fact before the Council. We have, then (reply the Council), nothing more to do. "Let the ancient customs hold their sway." Let these Bishops remain under the See of Alexandria, since this arrangement is of long standing, it being customary with the Bishop of Rome to act upon it, as had actually happened in the case of St. Dionysius the Pope, and some Bishops of Upper Nubia.

This interpretation, which is that of Baronius and Bellarmine, would be greatly strengthened if we accept the heading to this Canon which was read by the Roman Legates at the Council of Chalcedon, viz., "the Church of Rome always held the Primacy." Aetius, the Archdeacon of Constantinople, is supposed to have read out a copy of the Canon without this heading. But there is no suggestion that this was in opposition to the Legate's version. Canon Carter, indeed, informs us ("Roman Question," p. 17) that the Legate's version was objected to by the Fathers, as at variance with the genuine text. But this is pure invention on the Canon's part. And when he goes on to say that "the original text was in consequence referred to," and then that "the Roman version was seen to be spurious," he is simply indulging in fable. There is nothing of the sort to be found in the acts of the Council—not a word. Canon Bright also indulges his imagination when he says that the Roman version "was pleaded and rejected as spurious." There is, in fact, no record of any remarks of the Bishops on the matter. It is, indeed, open to serious question whether these words ascribed to Aetius are not an interpolation, as the Ballerini and Hefele give good reasons for supposing. But it is anyhow far more likely that the Legate's copy taken from the archives of Rome was the correct one. It seems pretty certain that it was accepted by the Council as such, considering the declaration of the *gloriosi principes* at the conclusion of the discussion. They said that from all that had taken place, they gathered "that all primacy and the principal honour "according to the Canons belong to the Archbishop of ancient "Rome, most beloved of God" (Hard. ii. p. 642).

Whether, then, we understand the Canon as expressing the adhesion of the Nicene Fathers to the long-established usage of patriarchal sway on the part of Alexandria, on the ground of Rome being the model, or on the ground of her being the source of patriarchal power (the former not excluding the latter), which she undoubtedly was to Alexandria, the witness borne by the Canon to an already developed hierarchy in the Episcopate is decisive. It cannot, according to the Nicene Fathers, be tampered with, even by themselves alone. It is not for them to disturb the ancient customs. Rome's action settles the question.

The Council of Nicæa is alluded to by St. Nicolas in his letter to the Emperor Michael; and he draws the same conclusion. He speaks of its being plain to those who "diligently inspect" the history of the Council; and he quotes St. Boniface's letter to the Bishops of Thessaly, in which that Pope reminds them that the Nicene Fathers did not venture to lay down anything affecting the dignity of the See of St. Peter, since they knew that "that was bestowed by the word of the Lord," a quotation which completely disposes of another pivot of the Anglican theory, viz., that St. Nicolas relied on the Forged Decretals for the principles on which he acted. Bishop Creighton, in his "History of the Papacy" (Introd. chapter) informs his readers that Nicolas "made haste to use" those Decretals. Dean Milman, followed by Canon Liddon in his Bampton Lectures (Lect. viii.), tells us that St. Nicolas "eagerly seized upon them." As a matter of fact, there is no one instance of his having quoted from them. Deciding that not all Decretals which are lacking from the Roman archives are necessarily false, is not quoting them; but that is all that St. Nicolas did. His quotations are from other sources, and are accurate, and amongst them is this from St. Boniface concerning the Council of Nicæa, which would render unnecessary any resort to pseudo-Decretals, so far as the fundamental principle of his teaching is concerned.

So far, then, as the historical Christianity of the first three and a half centuries is concerned, it cannot be said that "Episcopal independence" is a primitive principle. The Church, according to the Anglican theory, is an entirely different thing from the Church as it appears in those first centuries. In them she is a body numerically one, linked together not merely by a hidden unity, but by external union. Her polity is already articulate, uniform, hierarchical. At the summit stands the See of St. Peter. But according to the Anglican theory, she is capable of being a torn, rent body—a number of national units, a heap of sand, instead of a compact organisation co-extensive with her existence. A province, according to that theory, may tear itself away, under an Elizabeth, and after altering all its standards, and its liturgy, may call itself an independent National Church. There is nothing in the primitive Church to countenance this.

LUKE RIVINGTON.

APOSTOLIC LETTER OF LEO XIII. ON THE  
GOVERNMENT OF THE ANGLO-BENE-  
DICTINE CONGREGATION.

*Litterae Apostolicae de Reginane et Disciplina Congregationis Anglo-  
Benedictinae Novanda.*

LEO EPISCOPVS,

SERVVS SERVORVM DEI AD PERPETVAM REI MEMORIAM.

**R**ELIGIOSVS Ordo Benedicti Patris de rationibus Ecclesiae reique publicae quum praeclare apud multas gentes sit meritus, tum apud Anglos meritus est praeclarissime.—Alumnos eius, extremo saeculo sexto, illuc miserat S. Gregorius Magnus, Angliae merito vocatus apostolus, ut gentem Evangelii ignoratione miserrimam eruerent et rite adiungerent Christo. Quod illi quidem constanti laborum, copiâ doctrinae, splendore virtutum, optime, Deo adiuvante, fecerunt; iidemque instituta et artes verae solidaeque humanitatis in eas regiones feliciter invexerunt.—Huiusmodi beneficia gens anglica quanti par erat aestimans, Ordinem Benedictinum summo semper obsequio et benevola gratia prosecuta est: quo mirabiliter factum, ut in dies et ille sedes suas viresque latius protulerit, et haec laetioribus aucta sit fructibus urbanitatis omnis maximeque religionis, a qua commemorablem etiam sanctitatis laudem in Ecclesiae fastis obtinuit.

At vero, saeculo sexto decimo, propter acerbissimum illud et perquam calamitosum a catholica fide dissidium, communia religiosorum domicilia depopulata et eversa sunt, monachi vel necati vel dispersi; ut sub initium saeculi consequentis vix unus, Sigibertus Buckley, de ingenti Benedictinorum numero fuerit reliquus. Qui vehementer dolens suorum vicem rerumque maximarum ruinam, reputare animo coepit, si quo modo opem aliquam et religioni et patriae et suis posset afferre. Ipse igitur nonnullis aliunde monachis sibi consociatis, adlectisque et sacra veste ornatis adolescentibus nonnullis anglis, initia posuit Sodalitatis seu Congregationis, quae etiamnum viget, Anglo-Benedictinae: cuius praecipue laboribus referenda quae apud eam nobilissimam nationem Ecclesia catholica subinde potuit reparare.—Susceptum a Sigiberto consilium inceptumque opus vix dicere attinet quam gratum et acceptum extiterit Pontificibus romanis, qui tamquam, singulare Dei providentis subsidium in ipso inesse agnoscentes, curas omnes contulerunt, ut excitata Soldalitas in spem magnam saluberrimae virtutis Angliae laboranti floresceret. Eam litteris *Cum sicut accepimus*, datis die XXIV decembris anno MDCXII, Paulus V collaudavit, rectoque eiusdem ordini prospexit, novem iussis *definitoribus*, qui et incerta quaedam Sodalitatis negotia transigerent, et accommodatas ipsi Constitutiones scriberent, legum instar habendas; scriptas autem,

auctoritate ipsa apostolica, litteris *Ex incumbenti*, die xxiii agusti anno mdcxix, probavit et gravissime sanxit.—Quae decessoris acta Urbanus VIII, Constitutione *Plantata*, die xii iulii anno mdcxxxiii, ample confirmavit; multa Sodalitati privilegia concessit, certamque regiminis formam praescripsit, ad ea quoque munera, quae *Missiones* nominant, rite obeunda.—Deinde Benedictus XIV, Constitutione *Apostolicum ministerium*, die xxx maii anno mdccliii, ea ipsa privilegia rata firmaque habuit, atque etiam officia definivit quae monachis missionariis intercederent cum Vicariis apostolicis, rei sacrae in insula ante illud tempus praefectis.—Tum Pius IX f. r. anno mdcclviii curavit effecitque ut ex conventus seu capituli generalis consulto integra communis vitae disciplina in Sodalitatem universam induceretur; die autem xx maii anno mdcclx statuit, unam eandemque domum initialibus omnibus probandis esse debere.

Familiae Anglo-Benedictinae curam haud mediocrem Nos item gessimus; et meminisse placet, quum anno mdcclxxxii inspectorem sive, ut vocant, visitatorem legavimus dilectum filium Bonifacium Krug, sodalem benedictinum, qui nomine Nostro cognosceret in rem praesentem quemadmodum ipsius rationes sese haberent, quidque a Nobis curationis forte postularent, et plene ad Nos referret. Relata ab illo ut summa cum diligentia prudentiaque expenderentur, singulare quoddam Consilium delegimus S. R. E. Cardinalium; qui viderent praeterea et censerent quaenam toti Sodalitati et apostolico missionum muneri, cui sese alumni fagnam partem dedunt, possent aptius procedere: ad ipsorum vero consultationes, die vi iulii anno mdcclxxxiii, comprobando rescripsimus.—Iam nunc optantes eo amplius testificari, et qua Nos Sodalitatem ipsam voluntate complectimur, et quanto studio dignitatis eius tenemur, rati sumus tempestive et optime factum, si per Nos difficultates quaedam radicitus evellerentur quibus illa constringitur ne pleno gradu ad propositum suum contendat.—Quarum causa difficultatem quia residet in forma nunc valente regiminis eius, hanc visum est prudenti temperatione novari oportere, ut et temporum conveniat naturae, et propria Ordinis instituta retineat. Formam enim regiminis, quae in praesentia valet, ideo Urbanus VIII Constitutione *Plantata* edixit, quod nullum in Anglia per illa tempora erat monasterium, neque per conditiones rei sacrae et civilis esse licebat: quapropter decrevit, ut *Congregatio Anglicana sic stabilita regeretur ab uno Superiore, vocato Praeside, qui extra Angliam resideret durante schismate, et a duobus Provincialibus immediate sub dicto Praeside in Anglia; parique modo a Prioribus Residentiarum seu Conventuum extra Angliam; et deinde certo etiam numero Definitorum.* Hoc modo iurisdictio in missiones et in monachos eis deditos adempta est Monasteriis, a quibus ipsi excepti, quibusque tum etiam cum missionale munus exercerent erant devincti, atque binis Provincialibus ibidem consistentibus tota est transmissa: quod sane fuit pro rebus locisque sapienter constitutum, atque adeo necessarium, ne Missiones inopia gubernationis laborarent, neque minus ut missionariis communis esset sedes ac veluti centrum quo se in rebus omnibus veterent.—Ubi vero, conversis per Angliam temporibus, aliquot ibi coenobia restitui coepta sunt suisque praepositis regi, fieri certe

debat, id quod brevi est factum, ut, ea manente disciplina, incommoda non pauca neque levia occurrerent, totius videlicet Congregationis rectio, duplicata quasi potestate, funditus misceretur. Hisce maxime temporibus res eo venit, ut ipsa periclitetur Sodalitatis concordia : sunt enim qui haec in quaestionem adducant, Congregatio ne Anglo-Benedictina per se et naturâ sua monastica sit an missionalis ; itemque, utrum ad Monasteria summa potestatis pertineat, ob eamque causam debeant illis Missiones parere, an vero sit Missionibus integrum suis propriis legibus facere, omni solutis erga illa obsequio.—Iamvero apertissime patet Congregationem Anglo-Benedictinam suapte natura monasticam esse ; eatenus autem missionalem, quia et aliis munerum sacrorum officiis et missionibus pariter dare operam consuevit : ex quo aequè patet debere Missiones Monasteriis, nequaquam haec illis, parere. Id quippe omnino exposcit ipsius ratio et causa Congregationis, concinente palam historia teste. Et ipsa enim, ut alius quivis religiosorum Ordo, duo quaedam, alterum ab altero distinctum tamquam fines, spectat et sequitur : primum, ut alumnos ad omnem animi sanctimoniam consiliorum evangelicorum ductu erudiat, operibus iis fungendis quae sibi ex suis legibus propria sunt et praecipua ; proximum, ut alia accuret et peragat opera ad quae actuosam suorum virtutem porrigere possit et velit. In eo igitur primo quum vis et natura Ordinis posita sit, inde profecto normae et leges, quibus ipse dirigatur, petendae : eisdem vero legibus cetera, quaecumque in proximo continentur, necesse est obsequantur et serviant, nequaquam contra, quod praeposere fuerit.—Itaque Anglo-Benedictinae Congregationis vis et natura, quam esse usquequaque monasticam et regulae ipsae et constitutiones et annales declarant, hoc suo vult iure, ut qui monasteriis plena cum potestate praesint, iidem ipsam omnibus partibus, sive intra coenobiorum septa, sive extra, in varia munerum functione, pari cum potestate regant et moderentur.—Neque secus decursu temporum actum. Etenim anno DLXXXVI S. Augustinus una cum sociis monachis ad quadraginta, iussu S. Gregorii Magni, in Angliam perrexit *ut gentes illas ad Christum converteret* ; ubi voluntati Pontificis religiosissime obtemperans, *non alios ministros instituit esse quam monachos*.<sup>\*</sup> Hac de causa primum aggressus est ad monasterium Cantuariæ, in urbe principe, aedificandum, a quo omnis deinde pendebat rectio non solum de custodia legitimæ disciplinae, verum etiam de officiis ad animorum salutem explendis. Sic enimvero statueret S. Gregorius, alumnos Benedictinos simul apostolos simul monachos agere, ut monasteria tanquam sedes quasdam apostolatus haberent ; abbates autem procurationem omnem gerere ecclesiarum quas monachi (neque enim alii per eas regiones erant clerici) pro fidelium accessionibus essent condituri.—Ex eo fiebat, ut quamquam monachi per omnia sacerdotii munia studiosissime versarentur ; tamen rerum omnium summa et gubernatio in monasteriis penes abbates consisteret. Erant in insula, octavo sæculo ineunte, monasteria eaque ampla octo : inde quaerebantur episcopi, qui quidem apud ipsa convenienter habitant, sed integra in

<sup>\*</sup> Mabillon, Annal. benedict. an. 601.



monachos missionarios abbatibus manebat auctoritas.\* Tali disciplinae ratione Congregatio magis deinceps magisque floruit, ut saeculo quinto decimo *abbatias* quadraginta duas, *prioratus* duo et viginti obtineret: atque uno perpetuoque tenore ad excidium usque postero saeculo illatum perseveravit.—Iamvero quae ibidem nunc est Sodalitas, eadem omnino habenda est atque illa, quippe quae a monacho veterum superstitie sit instaurata, eodemque intendat, ad christianam Anglorum institutionem: siquidem quod veteres in eos facere, ab ethnica ignominia et superstitione deducendo, hoc novi facere insistant, ad catholicam fidem reduciendo.

Hac in causa decessores Nostri, fautores eiusdem Sodalitatis amplissimi, nihil sane ullo tempore decreverunt quo in ipsam alium naturam modum gubernationis velle viderentur inducere: atque immo ex ipsa Constitutione *Plantata*, qui recte penitusque inquisiverit, contrarium quiddam non obscure apparebit.—Quod enim, interdictis per ea tempora monasteriis in Anglia, neque praepositi quidem monachorum poterant ibi esse, quorum vigilantia consillisque Benedictini missionarii, ut oportebat, regerentur, idcirco ab Urbano cautum est, ut bini in eam curam designati provinciales incumberent. Id autem, non ad perpetuitatem fuisse factum sed per exceptionem dilatoriam, tandiu videlicet mansurum et valiturum quoad rebus temporibusque cedendum, non uno ex loco eiusdem Constitutionis pernosce licet: ubi edictum ut *Praeses resideret extra Angliam, durante schismate*; ubi etiam datum posse Congregationem a *Prioribus Residentiarum seu Conventuum extra Angliam* regi: quae sane dum finibus ditionis suae essent illi prohibiti. Accedit quod ipse Pontifex salva esse decrevit *privilegia, gratias, indulta, facultates, praerogativas Ordinis et Congregationis Nigrorum nuncupatorum S. Benedicti ac illius Monasteriorum in Anglia*,† in hisque ecclesiarum novem iura cathedralia: quo decreto, tacite is quidem, sed valde affirmavit, curiarum omnium ecclesiarumque administrationem quarum utilitatibus Benedictini servirent, ad eorumdem monasteria, si quando essent in integrum restituta, nihil secus quam, ante schisma pertinere: tantum igitur abest ut ea Constitutione potestati monasticae Urbanus sit refragatus.—Accedit etiam quod ita fert universe consuetudo Ordinis Benedictini: namque et apud alias eiusdem Ordinis familias, quidquid potestatis est in missiones et in alumnos missionarios, id alii defertur nemini quam coenobiorum praepostis: neque vero quisquam ignorat abbatias esse, quae non modo sibi metipsae consulant, sed ecclesiis externis curiisque haud ita paucis ius dicant easque undique administrent.—Talis autem sociandae temperandaeque potestatis modus, ut Monasteriis Missiones pareant, etiam propter praeclaras opportunitates quae utramque in partem redundare possunt, optandus maxime est. Quod enim Monasteria, ut inter omnes constat, se minus prospere a legitima disciplina studiisque maioribus nunc habent, eius rei causa non in alumnos, quorum voluntas vel opera desideretur, at vero in rerum hominumque inopiam,

\* Mabillon, *Annal. benedict.* an. 731–734.

† *Const. Plantata.*

et in laborum, quae inde consequitur, immoderationem procul dubio debet conferri: quibus incommodis remedium optimum suppetet, si ex eodem capite aequabilis providentiae ratio in commune manarit.— Similia adiumenta et fortasse maiora ad Missiones erunt profectura. Ut enim benevertant et fructus proferant vere salutare, opus est illis non ministerio tantum monachorum, sed multo magis exemplis eorum sanctissimis, quae mirifice possunt ad veritatem persuadendam, ad virtutem commendandam: et licet cultores tales evangelicae vineae, industrii probabilesque, non desint, eo tamen plures numerabuntur et plus auctoritate valebunt quo Monasteriis praesidia institutionis accreverint, et lux domesticae perfectionis praestiterit.—Edendis insuper scriptis quum campus Missionibus pateat copiae multiplicis, in quo Ordo Benedictinus per aetates omnes tanta cum gloria elaboravit, in eo ipso Familia Anglica, coniunctis animis et laboribus, doctrinarum studiis excitatis atque in melius provectis, honeste poterit utiliterque certare: scripta enim eruditionis plena et litteratae gravitatis admodum in Anglia proficiunt, ubi intelligentis iudicii viris quaesita probantur, scriptoribus catholicis gratiam conciliant, reverentiam eliciunt erga Ecclesiam romanam, ad eamque, quod fit persaepe, devios invitant.— Illa quoque laboriosa et magni momenti opera, quam imbuendae edocendaeque iuventuti in ludis litterariis et in ephebeis missionarii impendunt, ex actiore cum Monasteriis necessitudine futurum profecto erit, ut perfectius quiddam contingat, proptereaque fiat et in existimatione amplior et civitati multis modis uberior.

Huc nimirum ut una ex Monasteriis ac Missionibus communio evaderet, sic ut coenobiorum praepositis, tamquam potestatis munere antecedentibus, monachi missionarii subessent et obedirent, responsa spectaverunt, a delectis Cardinalibus data et auctoritate Nostra firmata. Etsi vero ad caput quaestionis primum: "Derogandum ne et quonam modo de Urbaniana Constitutione *Plantata* pro Congregatione Anglo-Benedictina?" responsum est: "Non videri de ea derogandum: " non tamen id factum perinde quasi ea rectionis ratio nullâ visa sit emanatione aut immutatione egere, et verius quia spes erat fore ut eiusmodi rogatio a monachis ipsis proficisceretur, saepius antea professis, huius Apostolicae Sedis optatis nihilo minus quam monitis praeceptisque omni se velle et demissione obsequi et diligentia satisfacere: quo nullum quidem exhibuissent testimonium aut per se praeclarius aut acceptius Nobis pietatis studii sui erga ipsam Apostolicam Sedem atque erga parentem Congregationem.—Sed enim mens et voluntas Nostra cognita satis declarataque erat ex subiectis ad cetera capita quaestionum responsis. Scilicet ad caput secundum hoc modo positum: "Utrum consulendum et quonam pacto Missionibus et rationi studiorum, eiusque rei gratiâ retinenda ne disciplina de uno eodemque tirocinii domicilio?" responsum est: "Placere ita consulendum, ut ne aliae postea suscipiantur missiones, nisi de Apostolicae Sedis venia, delectisque ad id opus monachis doctrina et exemplo probatis; ut praeses, definitores, provinciales in monasteriis habeant sedes; ut cursus et ratio studiorum ad normam Constitutionum (cap. xvii.) exigantur, hoc praeterea suaso, ut alumni optima spe praecluentes,

Romam Doctrinarum cognitione plenius perfectiusque imbuendi mittantur : ut unica omnibus sit ponendi tirocinii domus ; ut conventus seu capitulum generale ex iis dumtaxat titularibus fiat qui iurisdictione potiantur." Quae consulta, et voluntatis Nostrae significationes, ad id quod Nobis tantopere erat et est in votis, concordiam nempe et perfectum universae Sodalitatis, rectissime singula conducebant.—Primo enim, ne Monasteriis onera adderentur ad ea quibus fatigata et paene oppressa languescunt, provisum, nullas postea missiones, nisi concedente Apostolica Sede, suscipiendas. Tum ne iuniore aetate monachi, quum non satis vel scientia instructi vel legitima disciplina essent conformati, missionali muneri addicerentur, neve in coenobiis ob sodalium paucitatem communia officia iacerent, praescriptum, ut id muneris monachis imponeretur doctrinae laude et integritate exempli probatis.—Item, ad excitanda studia sapientiae et ad pristinum decus revehenda, praescriptum, ut eorum ratio ad optimas normas Constitutionum, exigeretur, alumnis autem praestantioribus maior quaedam petenda esset Romae perfectio. Sic etiam, coniunctionis causâ monachos inter conventuales et missionarios, utque Missionum totiusque Congregationis rectio in Monasteriis adstricta consisteret, iussi praeses definidores, provinciales degere in coenobiis atque ex regula vivere ; quo simul persuasum haberent, utramque vitae rationem, monasticam et missionalem, apposite inter se cohaerere.—Praeterea, ut commune sibi esse propositum, etsi per diversa officia assequendum, alumni omnes mature tenerent, praescriptio confirmata de unico thronibus probandis exercendisque domicilio. Postremo, ne in capitulis generalibus, superante missionariorum numero, conventuales decederent, adhibita cautio ut, sublata consuetudine qua ius ad ea conveniendi suffragiique ferendi titularibus, ut loquuntur, vel potestatis expertibus permittebatur, illis proprie attribueretur qui cum iurisdictione praeesent.—Ob eandem causam illi ipsi delecti Cardinales, ad quaestionem quintam : "Reformandae ne et quibusnam modis constitutiones Anglo-Benedictinae?" responderunt : "Censere se reformandas, hac mente, ut ex ipsa Congregatione quinqueviri designentur, scilicet Praeses generalis et quatuor sub eo monachi in consilium vocati ; quorum sit Constitutiones recognoscere, et referre quae, salvâ earumdem re, novanda videantur ; qua in opera suus etiam sit locus et responsis datis ad superiora quaestionum capita, et decretis recentibus *Super statu Regularium* de novitiorum cooptatione ac professione, et immutatis in Anglia rei sacrae civilisque conditionibus ; ita demum ut Sodalitas, integro quidem instituto Missionum, de religione tamen et studio monasticae legis, a S. Benedicto traditae, nihil admodum remittat, quin immo acrius ea quotidie intendat." Ex quo omnino sequebatur, quaevis praescripta, cum sancta Patris legiferi disciplina minus congruentia, quae necessitas quaedam per impedita tempora a diecisset, ea deinde, conversis compositisque rebus, de Constitutionibus demi atque abrogari oportere.

Istis Nos causis permoti, ad tuitionem et incrementa Familiae Anglo-Benedictinae, quo voluntatum inter alumnos consensione studiorumque conspiratione felicius vigeat ; quo possit ad priscae Sodalitatis, unde

continuata existit, amplitudinem gloriae enixius procedere: quo ipsius opera ni colendis missionibus uberiore cum fructu succedat, autoritate Nostra Apostolica haec decernimus et praecipimus:

I. Derogantes Urbani VIII. Constitutioni *Plantata*, ex qua parte regimen attingit Congregationis Benedictinae et missionariorum in Anglia, munera provincialium pariterque binas missionales provincias deleamus ac deletas edicimus.

II. Missiones quae ibi nunc sunt, et quotquot, concessu huius Apostolicae Sedis, a Congregationis alumni sint ibidem constituendae, coniungantur omnes cum Monasteriis, ab eorumque Praepositis gubernentur, quorum iurisdictioni, tum in sacris tum in externis rebus, missiones et missionarios subiicimus: iura vero sint salva Episcopis aliisque Ordinariis per sacros canones constitutionesque apostolicas reservata.

III. Facultates et privilegia Provincialium vel Definitorum propria, quatenus curam spectant missionum et missionariorum, quocumque illis modo, sive ab Apostolica Sede, sive ex capitulis generalibus vel constitutionibus, tributa, ea omnia ad Praepositos monasteriorum transferimus, adeo ut ipsi eorumque consiliarii facultatibus et privilegiis fruantur omnibus quibus illi antehac fruebantur.

IV. Iidem vero Praepositi, in iis quoque rebus quae sunt ad missiones et missionarios, Praesidi generali consilioque eius sint dicto audientes; neque, nisi scientibus illis et consentientibus, monachum ullum missionibus destinant.

V. Praeses generalis, et consilium eius dent operam, ut adolescentes alumni ad doctrinas et monasticas virtutes ratione gravissima instituuntur: neque committant, ut quisquam addicatur missionibus, cuius non exploratam habuerint ad id munus indolem et facultatem: quod si alumni desint idonei, per vicarios e clero externo curent supplendum.

VI. Praeses generalis, collatis consiliis cum coenobiorum Praepositis, provideat quemadmodum missionarii quotannis possint in sua quisque monasteria secedere, ibique aliquandiu, nec mense minus, esse, ut sanctioris disciplinae usu statoque piarum exercitationum curriculo animos reficiant et excolant.

VII. Ad haec iubemus, certum consilium quamprimum cogi, ex Praeside generali, tamquam moderatore, ex Praepositis qui nunc sunt coenobiorum, tribusque Monachis prudentia imprimis et doctrina spectatis, quos ipse legerit Praeses ex iis qui missionibus vacant.—Talis consilii haec sint mandata: primum, ut iam constitutas missiones assignet inter monasteria; facta ipsi potestate, nova etiam pro communi missionum bono constituendi: alterum, ut capita pecuniae, quae apud Provinciales in missionum procuracionem deposita sunt, excipiat et aequas in partes tribuat monasteriis, a quibus in posterum, secundum Constitutionem Nostram *Romanos Pontifices*, editam die VIII maii anno MDCCCLXXXI administrantur: tertium, ut novum Constitutionum ordinem conficiat, in quo digerendo adhaereat praesentis Constitutionis decretis, diligenterque respiciat ad ea quae sunt antehac sancita, de integra legitimaque communis vitae disciplina observanda, de unica tirocinii domo habenda, de sede Praesidis generalis consiliique eius in coenobiis tenenda, de vocandis ad capitula generalia, neque praeter-

mittat recentia decreta *super statu Regularium* de novitiorum cooptatione ac professione. Mandatis primo et alteri, intra sex menses ab hac edita Constitutione, tertio autem intra annum, ab ipso consilio sit satisfactum.

Igitur quaecumque his litteris decreta ac declarata et sancita sunt, ab omnibus ad quos pertinet servari volumus ac mandamus, nec ea notari, infringi et in controversiam vocari posse, ex quavis, licet privilegiata causa, colore et nomine; sed plenarios et integros effectus suos habere, non obstantibus praemissis et, quatenus opus sit, Nostrae et Cancellariae Apostolicae regulis, Urbani VIII. aliisque Apostolicis, etiam in generalibus ac provincialibus conciliis editis, constitutionibus, nec non quibusvis etiam confirmatione Apostolica vel quavis alia firmitate roboratis statutis, consuetudinibus ac praescriptionibus; quibus omnibus, perinde ac si de verbo ad verbum hisce litteris inserta essent, ad praemissorum effectum, specialiter et expresse derogamus et derogatum esse volumus, ceterisque in contrarium facientibus quibuscumque.

Datum Romae apud S. Petrum Anno Incarnationis Dominicae Millesimo Octingentesimo Nonagesimo, Pridie Idus Novembris Pontificatus Nostri anno XIII.

A CARD. BIANCHI PRO-DAT.—M. CARD. LEDOCHÓWSKI.

VISA

DE CVRIA I. DE AQVILA E VICECOMITIBVS.

Loco ✕ Plumbi

Reg. in Secret. Brevium.

I. CVGNONIVS.

---

— 333 —

ENCYCLICAL LETTER OF LEO XIII. TO THE  
BISHOPS OF THE CATHOLIC WORLD  
ON THE ABOLITION OF SLAVERY.

VENERABILIS FRATER.

SALVTEM ET APOSTOLICAM BENEDICTIONEM.

**C**ATHOLICAE Ecclesiae, quae omnes homines materna caritate complectitur, nihil fere antiquius fuit inde ab initio, ceu nosti, Venerabilis Frater, quam ut servitutem, quae misero iugo premebat mortalium quamplurimos, sublatam cerneret penitusque deletam. Sedula enim custos doctrinae Conditoris sui, qui per se Ipse et Apostolorum voce docuerat homines fraternam necessitudinem quae iungit universos, utpote eadem origine cretos, eodem pretio redemptos, ad eandem vocatos beatitatem aeternam, suscepit neglectam servorum causam ac strenua vindex libertatis extitit, etsi, prout res et tempora ferebant, sensim rem gereret ac temperate. Scilicet id praestitit prudentia et consilio constanter postulans quod intendebat religionis, iustitiae et humanitatis nomine; quo facto de nationem prosperitate cultuque civili meruit optime.—Neque aetatis decursu hoc Ecclesiae studium adserendi mancipia in libertatem clanguit; imo quo fructuosius erat in dies, eo flagrabat impensius. Quod certissima testantur monumenta historiae, quae eo nomine plures commendavit posteritati Decessores Nostros, quos inter praestant S. Gregorius Magnus, Hadrianus I., Alexander III., Innocentius III., Gregorius IX., Pius II., Leo X., Paulus III., Urbanus VIII., Benedictus XIV., Pius VII., Gregorius XVI., qui omnem curam et operam contulere, ut servitutis institutio, ubi vigeat, exciderit, et caveretur ne unde exsecta fuerat, ibi eius germina reviviscerent.

Tantae laudis hereditas a Praedecessoribus tradita repudiari a Nobis non pterat: quare nulla praetermissa a Nobis occasio est, improbandi palam dammandique tetricam hanc servitutis pestem; ac data opera de ea re in litteris egimus, quas III. Nonas Maias anno MDCCCLXXXVIII. ad Episcopos Brasiliae dedimus, quibus gratulati sumus de iis, quae pro mancipiorum libertate in ea regione gesta fuerant laudabili exemplo privatim et publice, simulque ostendimus quantopere servitus religioni et humanae dignitati adversetur. Equidem cum ea scriberemus, vehementer commovebamur eorum conditione qui dominio subduntur alieno; ac multo acerbius affecti sumus narratione aerumnarum, quibus, conflictantur incolae universi regionum quarumdam Africae interioris. Miserum sane et horrendum memoratu est, quod certis nunciis accepimus, fere quadringenta Afrorum millia, nullo aetatis ac sexus discrimine quotannis abripi per vim e rusticis pagis, unde catenis vincti ac caesi verberibus longo itinere trahuntur ad fora, ubi pecudum instar promercalium exhibentur ac veneunt.—Quae cum testata essent ab iis



qui viderunt, et a recentibus exploratoribus Africae aequinoctialis confirmata, desiderio incensi sumus opitulandi pro viribus miseris illis, levandique eorum calamitatem. Propterea, nulla, interiecta mora, dilecto Filio Nostro Cardinali Carolo Martiali Lavigerie, cuius perspecta Nobis est alacritas ac zelus Apostolicus, curam demandavimus obeundi praecipuas Europae civitates, ut mercatus huius turpissimi ignominiam ostenderet, et Principum civiumque animos ad opem ferendam, aerumnosae genti inclinaret:—Quam ob rem gratiae Nobis habendae sunt Christo Domino, gentium omnium Redemptori amantissimo, qui pro benignitate sua passus non est curas Nostras in irritum cedere, sed voluit esse quasi semen feraci creditum humo quod laetem segetem pollicetur. Namque et Rectores populorum et Catholici ex toto terrarum orbe, omnes demum, quibus sancta sunt gentium et naturae iura, certarunt inquirere, qua potissimum ratione et ope conniti praestet, ut inhumanum illud commercium evallatur radicitus. Solemnis Conventus non ita pridem Bruxellis actus, quo Legati Principum Europae congressi sunt, ac recentior coetus privatorum virorum, qui eodem spectantes magno animo Lutetiam convenere, manifesto portendunt tanta vi et constantia Nigritarum causam defensum iri, quanta est ea qua premuntur aerumnarum moles. Quare oblatam iterum occasionem nolumus omittere, ut meritas agamus laudes et gratias Europae Principibus ceterisque bonae voluntatis hominibus, atque a summo Deo precamur enixe, ut eorum consiliis et orsis tanti operis prosperos dare velit eventus.

At vero praeter tuendae libertatis curam, gravior alia pressius attingit apostolicum ministerium Nostrum quod Nos curare iubet, ut in Africae regionibus propagetur Evangelii doctrina, quae illarum incolas sedentes in tenebris, a caeca superstitione offusis, illustret divinae veritatis luce, per quam nobiscum fiant participes hereditatis Regni Dei. Id autem eo curamus enixius, quod illi, hac luce recepta, etiam humanae servitutis ab se iugum excutient. Ubi enim christiani mores legesque vigent, ubi religio sic homines instituit, ut iustitiam servent atque in honore habeant humanam dignitatem, ubi late spiritus manavit fraternae caritatis, quam Christus nos docuit, ibi neque nec feritas, neque barbaria extare potest; sed floret morum suavitas, et civili ornato cultu christiana libertas.—Plures iam Apostolici viri, quasi Christi milites antesignani adiere regiones illas, ibique ad fratrum salutem non sudorem modo sed vitam ipsam profuderunt. Sed *messis quidem multa, operarii autem pauci*: quare opus est, ut alii quamplures eodem acti spiritu Dei, nulla verentes discrimina, incommoda et labores ad eas regiones pergant, ubi probrosum illud commercium exercetur, allaturum illarum incolis doctrinam Christi verae libertati coniunctam.—Verum tanti operis aggressio copias flagitat eius amplitudini pares. Non enim sine ingenti sumptu prospici potest Missionariorum institutioni, longis itineribus, parandis aedibus, templis excitandis et instruendis, aliisque id genus necessariis, quae quidem impendia per aliquot annos sustinenda erunt, donec in iis locis ubi consederint evangelii praecones, suis se sumptibus tueri possint. Utinam Nobis vires suppetere quibus possemus hoc onus suscipere. At quum

votis Nostris obsistant graves, in quibus versamur, rerum augustiae, te, Venerabilis Frater, aliosque sacrorum Antistites et Catholicos omnes paterna voce compellamus, et Vestrae eorumque caritati commendamus opus tam sanctum et salutare. Omnes enim participes eius optamus fieri, exigua licet collata stipe, ut dispartitum in plures onus levius cuique toleratu sit, atque ut in omnes effundatur gratia Christi, de cuius regni propugnatione agitur, eaque cunctis pacem, veniam peccatorum, et lectissima quaeque munera impertiat.

Propterea constituimus, ut quotannis, qua die in quibusque locis Epiphaniae Domini celebrantur mysteria, in subsidium memorati operis pecunia stipis instar corrogetur. Hanc autem solemnem diem prae ceteris elegimus quia, uti probe intelligis Venerabilis Frater, ea die Filius Dei primitus sese gentibus revelavit dum Magis videndum se praebeuit, qui ideo a S. Leone Magno decessore Nostro scite dicti sunt *vocationis nostrae fideique primitiae*. Itaque bona spe nitimur fore, ut Christus Dominus per motus caritate et precibus filiorum, qui veritatis lucem acceperunt, revelatione divinitatis suae etiam miserrimam illam humani generis partem illustret, eamque a superstitionis coena et aerumnosa conditione, in qua tamdiu abiecta et neglecta iacet, eripiat.

Placet autem Nobis, ut pecunia, praedicta die, collecta in ecclesiis et sacellis subiectis iurisdictioni tuae, Romam mittatur ad Sacrum Consilium Christiano nomini propagando. Huius porro munus erit partiendi eam pecuniam inter Missiones quae *ad delendam potissimum servitutem* in Africae regionibus extant aut instituentur: cuius partitionis hic modus erit, ut pecunia profecta ex nationibus, quae suas habent catholicas missiones ad vindicandos in libertatem servos, ut memoravimus, istis missionibus sustentandis iuvandisque addicatur. Reliquam vero stipem idem Sacrum Consilium, cui earumdem missionum necessitates compertae sunt, inter egentiores, prudenti iudicio partietur.

Equidem non ambigimus, quin vota Nostra pro infelicibus Afris concepta, benigne excipiat dives in misericordia Deus, ac tu Venerabilis Frater, ultro collaturus sis, studium operamque tuam, ut ea expleantur cumulate.—Confidimus insuper, per hoc temporarium ac peculiare subsidium, quod fideles conferent ad inhumani commercii labem abolendam et sustentandos evangelii nuncios in locis ubi illud viget, nihil imminentum iri de liberalitate qua Catholicas missiones adiuvare solent collata stipe in Institutum quod Lugduni conditum a *propagatione fidei* nomen accepit. Salutare hoc opus, quod fidelium studiis pridem commendavimus, hac nunc opportunitate oblata novo ornamus laudis testimonio, optantes ut late porrigat beneficentiam suam et laeta floreat prosperitate. Interim Tibi, Venerabilis Frater, Clero et fidelibus pastoralis vigilantiae tua commissis, Apostolicam Benedictionem peramanter impertimus.

Datum Romae apud S. Petrum, die xx. Novembris anno MDCCCXC., pontificatus Nostri decimo tertio.

LEO PP. XIII.

## Science Notices.

---

**The Recent Great Frost.—The Dry Period.**—According to the statistics that Mr. C. Harding has collected, the recent spell of cold was more prolonged in the neighbourhood of London than in any previous great frost during a period extending a little over a century, although the absolute minimum was not so low as on some of the other occasions. In 1788–9 the frost lasted forty-nine days, from November 26 to January 13; the mean of maximum and minimum was  $29^{\circ}.4$ ; the absolute minimum  $17^{\circ}.5$ . In 1794–5 the duration was fifty-two days, from December 18 to February 7. The mean maximum and minimum was  $28^{\circ}.0$ , the absolute minimum  $7^{\circ}$ . In 1813–14 the duration was forty-two days. The mean of maximum and minimum was  $27^{\circ}.3$ . The absolute minimum  $8^{\circ}$ . In 1838 the duration was fifty days, from January 5 to February 23. The mean of maximum and minimum was  $28^{\circ}.9$ , the absolute minimum  $-4^{\circ}.0$ . This is the lowest absolute minimum recorded during the period extending a little over 100 years. In 1855 the duration was forty-seven days, from January 10 to February 25. The mean of maximum and minimum was  $29^{\circ}.7$ , the absolute  $11^{\circ}.1$ . In 1860–1 the duration was thirty-six days, from December 15 to January 19. The mean of maximum and minimum was  $29^{\circ}.9$ , the absolute minimum  $8^{\circ}$ . In 1879 the duration was forty-four days, from November 14 to December 27. The mean of maximum and minimum was  $31^{\circ}.0$  the absolute minimum  $13^{\circ}.7$ . In 1881 the duration was twenty days. The mean of maximum and minimum was  $27^{\circ}.0$ , the absolute minimum  $12^{\circ}.7$ . In 1890–91 the duration was fifty-nine days, from November 25 to January 22, being seven days longer than the next longest spell, in 1794–5. The mean of maximum and minimum was  $29^{\circ}.3$ , the absolute minimum  $12^{\circ}.0$ .

The portion of the British Isles most severely visited by the frost was the south-east of England, the mean temperature for the fifty-nine days being more than  $2^{\circ}$  below the freezing-point, while at seaside places on the coast of Kent, Sussex, and Hampshire the mean was only  $32^{\circ}$ . A notable feature of the recent frost was its presence in places where genial conditions are generally found in the winter months, and which are the habitual resort of invalids, and its comparative absence in places that have the character of being more exposed to such conditions. At Biarritz frost occurred on thirty-one nights, whilst in the Shetlands there were only nine nights with frost. In the extreme north of Scotland the mean was  $10^{\circ}$  warmer than in the south-east of England, and less than  $1^{\circ}$  below the average. In the north of England the mean temperature was only  $5^{\circ}$  below the average. The lowest authentic reading on

the screen was  $0^{\circ}.6$  at Stokesay in Shropshire, and very nearly equally low temperatures occurred at other periods of the frost. At many places in the south and south-west of England, and in parts of Scotland and Ireland, the greatest cold was at the end of November. At Wadden, in Surrey, the thermometer in the screen fell to  $1^{\circ}$ , a reading which Mr. Harding says is quite unprecedented at that time of year. At Addington Hills, near Croydon, the shade thermometer was below the freezing-point every night, with one exception. There were only two exceptions, at Cambridge and Reading. In many parts of England the frost was continuous night and day for twenty-five days. At coast stations in the north of Scotland it in no case lasted throughout the twenty-four hours.

On the coast of Sussex the temperature of the sea was  $14^{\circ}$  warmer than the air during December, but on the Yorkshire coast it was only  $6^{\circ}$  warmer, and in the Shetlands and on parts of the Irish coast it was only  $3^{\circ}$  warmer. The Thames water off Deptford, at 2 feet below the surface, was continuously below  $34^{\circ}$  from December 23 to January 23, and the river was blocked with ice during the greater part of the time. In Regent's Park, where the ice attained a thickness of over 9 inches, skating continued without interruption for forty-three days. The frost did not penetrate to the depth of 2 feet below the surface of the ground in any part of England; but in many places the ground was frozen for several days at a depth of 1 foot, and at 6 inches it was frozen for upwards of a month.

It has been noticed that extraordinary cold periods are generally followed by periods of dryness. The recent frost has proved no exception in this respect. The month of February proved quite phenomenal in its dryness. According to Mr. S. J. Symonds, who has made continuous observations in the neighbourhood of London for some thirty-three years, the next driest February was in 1863, when 0.31 inch of rain fell. In February, 1891, only 0.01 inch fell, less than 1-13th of the rainfall in February 1863. In examining all the other months of the thirty-three years, Mr. Symonds finds that the driest was May 1885, when 0.36 inch fell. Therefore, February 1891 has beaten the record for dryness of any month of the year during thirty-three years.

**Steam Lifeboats.**—It has been said by those of experience in the "invention" market that there is no class of invention which offers so little chance of remuneration as one which has for its object the saving of human life. This statement seems borne out by the fact that some seventy years of practical steam navigation has been allowed to pass before that power has been successfully applied to a lifeboat. The National Lifeboat Association has for some time past been alive to the desideratum of possessing lifeboats worked by mechanical means. In 1886 a sub-committee was formed to examine the question, and the members visited the Liverpool Exhibition to ascertain whether any of the specimens there exhibited would fulfil the conditions requisite, but none of these satisfied them. In the following year the Institution endeavoured to stimulate inventive

genius by offering gold and silver medals to competition all over the world for models or drawings of mechanically propelled lifeboats, and experts were appointed as judges of the many models and drawings sent in, but they were all rejected as unsuitable for lifeboat work.

The difficult problem has at last been solved, as far as harbour lifeboats are concerned, by the joint endeavours of the National Lifeboat Institution and one of the oldest shipbuilding firms in this country, and the steam lifeboat lately completed, and now stationed at Harwich, has already proved of great efficiency in an emergency. In the construction of such a vessel one of the chief difficulties has been to obtain a minimum of weight. The first idea seems to have been to use electricity as the means of propulsion, but the weight of the storage batteries was considered excessive for the purpose. In the boat that is now completed the weight has been actually reduced to  $\frac{3}{4}$  cwt. per horse. This light weight is accomplished by the use of "forced draught," which gives great power just when required. The great perfection now arrived at in the manufacture of light steel is also an important factor in the success of the undertaking. The vessel is propelled by the hydraulic system—the "water-jet propeller." A paddle vessel would be quite unfit for such a purpose, as a paddle-wheel is easily disabled, and a screw, although in smooth water it is the most efficient means of absorbing the power, in such a service is open to many objections; it would be continually out of the water, and useless, besides which the "racing" of the propeller is liable to damage the machinery, and consequently the lifeboat might be completely disabled. The screw might also become fouled with wreckage, or broken when taking the ground, and the sailing power of the vessel is reduced by the dragging of the screw through the water. With hydraulic propulsion there is instantaneous propelling power, which is as efficient in rough seas as in smooth water. There is no racing or damaging of machinery, however much the vessel rolls or pitches. There is a simplicity of machinery, as the engine only runs in one direction, and there is no time lost in stopping and reversing for going astern. The vessel is easily managed by an officer on deck, who by working two handles can control the jets without any communication with the engine-room. A special feature to ensure strength is the rivetting, which is one-third more than is usual in a torpedo vessel. There is not a single rivetted seam throughout the whole boat. The length of the boat is only 50 feet, but it contains 72,000 rivets; placed end to end these rivets would extend three-quarters of a mile. The seaworthiness of the boat is amplified by fifteen water-tight compartments.

The extreme speed of the vessel is about 9·175 knots an hour; her extreme draught 3 ft. 6 in. The indicated horse-power is 170; steam 130 lbs. The consumption of coal, even under forced draught, is only 2 cwt. per hour, making it possible for the vessel to steam out to a wreck with thirty hours coal, giving her a radius of action of 254 knots,

at a speed of  $8\frac{1}{2}$  knots. The boat is fitted with a lug sail and jib. Before the lifeboat was allowed to take her present position she was subjected to some rigid tests. One of these was to test her stability. The vessel was fully weighted, and a heavy parbuckle placed round her. This was fastened to a steam crane, and the boat was inclined until she laid on her beam ends. In such a position any deficiency in her power of stability would have caused her to turn over, but she stood the test perfectly well, showing by the experiment that she possessed righting powers of over  $100^\circ$ .

On October 7 the lifeboat crew had their first call to embark in answer to signals of distress. The call was at 12.20 A.M. The men were under weigh, and ready for full speed at 12.48. The distressed vessel was on the Cork sands. The lifeboat arrived at the scene of disaster at 2 A.M. On this occasion the vessel seems to have fully realised the expectations that had been formed concerning her handiness for the work. She was able to round the ship, go alongside, and take the crew out with the greatest ease in shallow water, and with a heavy sea running.

Such a vessel as has been described is, however, only suitable for harbour stations. Harbour lifeboats are by no means the largest class of such vessels. The largest class are those which are launched from transporting carriages, on which they are taken to the most advantageous spot on the coast. In this class weight must be reduced to the extreme minimum, and such a vessel as has been described would be quite impracticable for this class, but as Mr. Corbett, who has studied the subject for some time past, has suggested, why should not an engine of very small dimensions be developed that would be more efficient than ten oars? The advantages of extending the steam lifeboat service are obvious. An especial advantage is the following. An ordinary lifeboat crew arrives at the scene of disaster, exhausted with the fatigue of battling with the waves, but those who are conveyed by mechanical means are comparatively fresh and vigorous.

**The Relation of Ground Water to Disease.**—The health of the world is so regulated by climatic conditions, that the side-by-side registers now in process of keeping, of diseases various, and meteorological conditions, must result in fuller knowledge of requisite sanitary requirements. Amongst such luminous registers is the late address to the Royal Meteorological Society of its new president, Mr. Baldwin Latham, on "The Relation of Ground Water to Disease." Most persons know that excessive dampness in the soil is favourable to phthisis and rheumatism, but few of the public are aware of the very intimate relations of life and death generally, with the condition of the surface soil, with its ground water and its ground air. In tabulating the influences of ground water, various other influences have to be allowed for and eliminated, such as heat, cold, the temperature of the ground, darkness—this latter a very unhealthy factor, and one that, in the consideration of many diseases, presents a parallelism with the percolation period—for the greatest



amount of percolation of water through the soil takes place during the period of greatest darkness, and many diseases have been found to increase with percolation, and decrease as percolation ceased. All these difficulties in the way of attaining reliable data of the effects of ground water seem to have been realised and met by Mr. Latham. His calculations extend over a sufficient number of years, and, taken mainly at Croydon, they allow duly for the fact of Croydon habitations extending over unpolluted and maiden soil, and for the protective influences of the various epidemics to which Croydon has been subject. He has considered mainly, in connection with ground water, zymotic diseases, the general death-rate, and the mortality of children under five years of age.

Ground water produced by percolation from rainfall, condensation, and in dry countries infiltration from rivers, is held in some stratas entirely by capillarity; in others, by both capillarity and as free water; and this free ground water may be increased without rain, in rapid falls of the barometer, by water held by capillarity passing from the superincumbent strata. Free ground water seems a very active agent, and when polluted could directly spread diseases to unlimited distances; in this connection Mr. Latham points out, "As a rule it is only in those places in which there has been a considerable amount of impurity stored up in the soil that diseases become manifest, and the most common mode by which diseases are disseminated is by means of the water supplies drawn from the ground, or by the introduction of contaminated ground air into the habitations of the people. It will also be found that the periods of low and high ground water mark, those epochs when certain organic changes take place in the impurities stored in the earth, and which ultimately become the cause, and lead to the spread of disease."

The charts of free ground water show that it rises and falls every year, and when plotted as a curve it forms a wavelike profile with a rise more sudden than its fall. It moves always in directions of natural outlets, such as seas, rivers, and, as might be expected, the fluctuations are greater at the greatest distance from the point of discharge, and less, close to same. The fluctuations have in some districts considerable amplitude, the water-line in their wells varying as much as 100 feet in the space of a few months: near the sea the fluctuations are much less. No great variation in the vertical rise and fall of subsoil water is the healthier condition, and in the various health resorts on the seaside a small rise and fall is almost always the rule.

Mr. Latham points out that the diseases of underground pollution are disseminated not only by the water but also by the underground air. The ground always contains air, and in addition, when the ground water diminishes, air is drawn in to occupy its place. The rainfall to enter this space must expel the air, and as the falling rain seals the earth where exposed, the air escapes in dry places, such as our houses. The fact of this air escaping at the first fall of the rain after a dry summer, from polluted soil, in whose impu-

rities organic changes are taking place, throws light on the observation that dry summers invariably mark unhealthy years; and the danger of the first repletion of the wells after low water is further emphasised by the occurrence of typhoid fever in the autumn rains.

An artificial lowering of the ground water by drainage works, by bringing about the same conditions, has the same effects on disease; such drainage works have often been followed by an outbreak of typhoid fever; and the frequent occurrence, in our old towns, of typhoid fever at the time of drainage is often ignorantly attributed by the inhabitants to the new system of sewerage.

All low water years seem unhealthy, and as dangerous to cattle as to men, while wet summers usually mark our healthiest periods. Mr. Latham tells us, "All the great epidemics of typhoid fever have occurred in years when the ground water was especially low," and all the outbreaks of typhoid fever which have been investigated in this country have occurred after a slight rise in the ground water.

With regard to the Croydon outbreaks, it is worth noting that the universal testimony of its inhabitants prove that women, children, and teetotalers suffered the most. In the last Croydon epidemic it appears that part of the town supplied with water from the river suffered far less in proportion than the divisions supplied from the ground. On the other hand, there are diseases more prevalent at times of high water. But Mr. Latham points out that such high water periods have sometimes followed immediately on markedly low water periods. One gathers from the statistics of observation this main fact, that the first passage of water through the ground is an unhealthy period.

With regard to the death-rate of children under five, it presents in the Croydon records an exact parallelism with the state of the ground water. In the general death rate the regulation by conditions of ground water is evident, but less marked.

**The Action of Light on Selenium—Photo-Electricity.**—The action of light on selenium has for some years past been attracting the attention and ingenuity of physicists. Professor Minchin has recently been experimenting with selenium cells, with a view of obtaining an electro-motive force in them under the action of light. The results of his investigations have been decidedly successful, and he has lately exhibited a seleno-aluminium battery, which, when illuminated by a taper, deflected an electrometer needle which actuated a relay and set an electric bell ringing. In these researches the best results have been obtained by means of aluminium electrodes, one of which is coated on one side with selenium. These so-called cells which, as Professor Minchin points out, might be more aptly named "selenium conductors," or "selenium resistances," are extremely sensitive to light from all parts of the spectrum, the greatest effect being produced in the yellow bordering on the green. These experiments may lead to the construction of a new and

thorough photo-meter, a laboratory instrument that is much wanted. Each light subjected to the test would be spread out into a spectrum, and the intensities of the different portions compared by their action on the selenium cell, the intensities of the different portions being proportional to the squares of the volts. It is suggested that the principle of Newton's chromatic circle would be applied to determine the resultant intensity of the light. Besides the possibilities of more accurate photometry suggested by these experiments, Professor Minchin thinks they may contribute to the solution of more ambitious problems. One of these is photography at a distance, an object which originated this new branch of physics, which is to be designated "Photo-electricity." The Professor, however, owns that he does not yet see his way to utilising the results of his work for obtaining a photograph at a distance. Another problem is the direct transformation of radiant solar energy into useful work.

In the opinion of some other scientists, these researches may throw light on other problems of physics which have been hitherto obscure; for instance, they may help to clear up the mystery of the changes that occur in the retina of the eye. Some time ago, Dr. Burton suggested that the action of light on the retina was a photo-chemical one. Until these researches were undertaken it was difficult to find substances that were sensitive to any but the most refrangible visible rays of the spectrum, viz., the blue and violet; and the eye was most sensitive to the green and yellow. It seems at present uncertain whether in the photo-electric batteries the electric current is directly started by the action of light, or through the medium of some chemical change in the cell produced by the light.

While Professor Minchin has been converting light into electricity by selenium cells, Mr. Shelford Bidwell has been performing some very striking experiments which will revive interest in another physical quality of selenium—viz., the variation in its electrical resistance under the action of light. In one of these experiments, Mr. Bidwell connected up a selenium cell with an electric bell and relay, in such a manner that the reduced resistance of the cell on exposure to light diminished the current throughout the relay, and stopped the bell from ringing. Mr. Bidwell then interposed various plates of glass between the cell and the source of light, which was a gas-burner, and found that red, orange, and yellow glasses produced no ringing of the bell, but when a green glass was employed the bell was set in action. Two shades of blue glass were then tried, one light, the other dark. The light blue stopped the bell, whereas dark blue had no effect. These latter experiments, in Mr. Bidwell's opinion, have only an illustrative value, but the fact that darkness may be used to start an electric current may, he thinks, turn out to be of practical use. He suggests that an accidental extinction of a ship's light, or of a railway signal, might be instantly revealed by such an apparatus as this. Mr. Bidwell has already devised what with the modesty of a savant he calls "a pretty scientific toy," in which an electric lamp is automatically lit when daylight falls below

a certain point. In the hands of the inventor and patentee this "toy" should become a perfection in practical electric lighting. The function of the lamplighter is already becoming less and less in requisition, owing to the progress of electrical industry, when a switch under the control of one individual can light thousands of lamps over a large area; but when the twilight hour can itself turn the switch then his services will be dispensed with altogether.

**Solar Disturbances.**—There seems now little doubt that the minimum of sun-spots was reached in November 1889, after a decline from the preceding maximum occupying five years and ten months. This might have been more prolonged but for the retardation of the last crisis from 1882, when it was due, until January 1884, the delay obtaining partial compensation, as might have been anticipated, through curtailment of the ensuing cycle. Thus the year 1890 was marked by an outbreak of fresh disturbances, separated from earlier ones partly by the intervention of a period of dead calm lasting eight weeks, partly by the locality of their appearance. The surest sign that the solar tide has turned is found in the development of spots in high latitudes subsequently to the extinction of a series closing down on either side towards the equator. And this was unmistakably the case near the epoch of the late minimum. Equatorial commotions died out at the beginning of 1889; some months later, high-latitude spots became visible; by 1890, the zones of conspicuous disturbance had definitively shifted some twenty degrees poleward; while the northern hemisphere simultaneously took over from the southern its long-maintained superiority in macular productivity.

The course of these vicissitudes was traced in duplicate, as it were, in the varying development of prominences. Father Jules Fenyi, S.J., Director of Cardinal Haynald's observatory at Kalocsa, in Hungary, observed spectroscopically at the edge of the sun, in 1890, eighteen of these marvellous appendages to attain a height of over 100" (equivalent to 45,000 English miles) as against six in 1889, their mean latitude increasing like that of the contemporaneous spots, with their frequency and size. A few were of prodigious dimensions. On August 15, 1890, a glowing structure, composed of hydrogen, helium, and calcium, mounted up to 145,000 miles above the sun's western limb; intensely luminous at the base, it paled above, and toppled over, as if through the action of a powerful drift of coronal materials towards the equator. The rate at which its summit was carried forward implied that it had fallen under the sway of a solar storm-breeze sweeping onward with a speed of about seventy miles an hour—a velocity rarely attained in the spires of the Atlantic cyclones that visit these shores, though usually far surpassed in American tornadoes and West Indian hurricanes. After three days, a successor to this monster flame was perceived in the shape of a broken group, 27,500 miles high, and vividly crimson, surmounted, up to at least 185,000 miles, by dispersed and completely detached fragments, some of these strangely luminous, others

—the topmost—fading out in a pink flush. This remarkable spectacle evidently resulted from a transient but violent eruption, the products of which expanded and dissolved in the rarer medium encountered in their compulsory ascent. A portion of them, too, was found to be travelling towards the earth with a velocity estimated at nearly 100 miles a second, although the remaining strata of incandescent gas were devoid of movement in the line of sight, the whole of their speed being expended in a perpendicular uprush. In a third prominence, observed October 6, this speed, as determined by the towering elevation of 145,000 miles to which it sprang in half an hour, was at the extraordinary rate of 170 miles a second! During the next four or five years similar phenomena may be expected frequently to recur, and their details cannot be too diligently recorded. For the behaviour of substances, whether solid, liquid, or gaseous, moving with great rapidity in the sun's neighbourhood, is fraught with instruction on many points of crucial importance as regards solar and stellar constitution, and the experiments bearing upon them, performed by nature for our benefit, should be, since they cannot be commanded, all the more diligently studied. Now spotted area always augments faster than it diminishes; the solar trouble comes to a head promptly, and is smoothed down by slower degrees. Hence, the next spot and prominence maximum may be looked for in 1893 or 1894, when the usual accompaniments of electrical disturbances—magnetic storms, auroræ in low latitudes, possibly conspicuous comets—will presumably manifest terrestrial and cosmical sympathy with the agitation of our ruling orb.

Meanwhile, an important series of observations on the spectra of sun-spots, carried on at Stonyhurst from 1882 to 1889, have been presented to the Royal Astronomical Society. Begun under Father Perry's direction, they have been continued on the lines laid down by him, and are now published by Father Cortie. Their general upshot is to afford partial confirmation to Mr. Lockyer's inference of cyclical changes in the spectra of sun-spots, corresponding to the well-watched cyclical changes in the energy of their development. These spectral vicissitudes are of an extremely intricate nature, and admit as yet of no confident interpretation. The view insisted upon by the South Kensington Professor, that they depend upon the progressive dissociation, through a presumed accession of solar heat at maximum, of known chemical "elements," and the substitution for them of their unknown constituents, does not account for all the facts, although it chimes in seductively with some of them. Further inquiries are urgently needed, and they will, in future, be prosecuted, at least in part, by the fruitful chemical method. With the object of rendering it fully applicable to this branch of research (already, in some degree, promoted by Mr. Lockyer), experiments are in progress at Stonyhurst; "and there is good reason to hope," Father Cortie adds, "that before very long we shall be in possession of a number of photographs of the spectra of sun-spots which will aid not a little to the solution of some pressing problems in solar physics."

To one interesting query in solar spectroscopy, Father Cortie finds himself in a position to return a decided negative. The presence in the Fraunhofer spectrum of a dark line matching the *bright* line of helium invariably derived from the solar chromosphere and prominences, has sometimes been affirmed, but as often denied. We are now made acquainted with what seems to be the indisputable fact of its non-existence. The fine, dusky lines near its place are air-lines—the production of our own atmosphere. Theoretically, the absorptive effects of this enigmatical substance *ought* to be visible; their absence is an unaccountable anomaly. But anomalies are often suggestive; and they, at any rate, serve the useful purpose of setting over-bold generalisations at naught.

**The Milky Way.**—The first practical attempt to investigate the nature of the stupendous starry collection girdling the celestial sphere with filmy light was made by Sir William Herschel. His method of “star-gauging” was a process for sounding space by counting the stars in successive equal areas of the sky, and thence inferring the comparative depth of the strata pierced by the line of sight. And, just as the contour of the sea-bottom can be determined from the graduated lengths of line needed to reach different parts of it, so the shape of the grand galactic aggregation was delineated from data furnished by operations for visually fathoming it. The result, however, could be admitted as valid only if a certain supposition upon which it was based corresponded with facts. At the outset of his career—for he subsequently abandoned the idea—Herschel considered the appearance of crowding in the Milky Way to be due to the immense lateral extent of the system, the stars composing which were on the whole, he thought, pretty equably distributed in space. If this were not so, the principle of star-gauging broke down, as it has undeniably broken down. The more closely the Milky Way is studied, the more irresistible becomes the conviction that it does *not* represent mere optical condensation through the vast range outward of its constituent strata, but that physical swarming can alone explain its peculiarities. It is, in fact, a great compound cluster, of approximately annular form, though fringed on all sides with branching appendages.

A compound cluster—that is to say, one made up of innumerable minor groups, themselves often, if not always, multiple. For in the Milky Way may be found cloud-like accumulations of many thousands of brilliant, if inconceivably remote, suns; while on closer scrutiny the cumuli frequently resolve themselves into wisps, rings, and sprays of stars, the outcome, doubtless, of special dynamical relations, which even the imagination is powerless to explore. The application, however, of photography to the study of internal galactic structure offers a boundless prospect of advance; and the initiative in this direction of Mr. Barnard has been ably seconded by Mr. Russell, at the Sydney Observatory, in New South Wales. Some of his pictures have been reproduced in the March number of *Knowledge*, and merit detailed examination. One, portraying a great star-drift in Sagittarius,



shows—as Mr. Ranyard has pointed out—some curious differences of illumination as compared with the Lick representation of the same bit of Milky Way scenery; but real variations on the requisite prodigious scale cannot be thought of as possible prior to actual demonstration of their having occurred. The unique peculiarities of arrangement exhibited in it as prevailing among the individual stars are described by Mr. Russell as follows: “It seems,” he remarks, “as if one were looking at curve after curve found farther and farther back in the infinity beyond, like eddies in an infinitely complex vortex, till they end in faint nebulous points of light, which can only just make themselves known after four hours of steady impact on the sensitive film.” To have obtained a permanent record of these marvels of creation is no small achievement; to speculate upon them would be premature.

Mr. Russell's photograph of the southern “coal-sack” differs materially from its effect to the eye. Instead of a large vacuity sharply and suddenly perforating the dense part of the Milky Way near the Cross, it comes out as an open sack, across the southern side of which a flood of minute stars has been poured, leaving only the northern corner blank and obscure. The chemical retina has also detected an extension of the tunnelling tendency in a partial clearing, in continuation, as it seems, of the coal-sack, terminated near  $\beta$  Centauri by a curved space about two degrees long and half a degree broad, absolutely destitute of stars. Another singularity of the Sydney pictures is the inconspicuousness in them of the “great rift,” dividing the Milky Way into a double stream all the way from Cygnus to the Centaur. The almost total *visual* deficiency of light throughout this interval is obliterated on the sensitive plate. Only by counting the stars can it be ascertained that it contains fewer per square degree than the bright branches on either side.

The interest of these experiments, however, culminates in two photographs of the Magellanic Clouds, obtained one with seven, the other with eight, hours of exposure. Since Sir John Herschel's time next to nothing had been done towards the investigation of these mixed systems of stars and nebulae—subordinate universes, as they might almost be termed, relegated to an otherwise desert region of space, yet not wholly cut off from the majestic general plan of nebular distribution. Now they unexpectedly disclose themselves in the guise of prodigious cosmical vortices. Their contents are marshalled along stream-lines, winding in closer and closer folds inward. The greater cloud appears to be of double organisation; it possesses two centres, each the starting-point of a wreathed luminous structure; moreover, it is guarded on either side by a pair of oval clusters showing the same description of convoluted interior arrangement. Their obvious dependence upon the great adjacent aggregation invites the conjecture that the radiant and beautiful globular cluster known as “47 Tucani,” situated in the immediate neighbourhood of the lesser Cloud, may likewise be related to it in some sort of satellite capacity.

More and more widely, with every fresh development of photographic power, a spiral conformation is found to prevail among cosmical bodies. The "maëlstrom nebula" (as it might be called) in Canes Venatici, has proved to be not merely the exemplar of a class, but the index to a law of far-reaching, perhaps universal, validity. Now, so far as we can interpret its workings, they seem characteristic of a state of transition. Convoluted systems cannot have attained to a state of equilibrium. They must include unbalanced movements; and unbalanced movements imply instability. The alternative presented is of continuous, though very gradual, descent towards, or of recession, similarly conducted, from a centre: the appearances would, in one or the other case, be the same. It is only certain that the ultimate form of such systems has not been reached; the creative thought working in them awaits a long future for its complete unfolding. Is the Milky Way itself in this condition? It is impossible to say. Efforts to expound its characteristics as those belonging to a "spiral stream of small stars" have met with scant success. A spiral should have a nucleus. Structure of the kind postulated presupposes strong central influence. It cannot be conceived of as suspended in space without a *point d'appui*. But there is none visible in the Milky Way. The interior of the ring formed by it is comparatively empty. No massive nucleus, fit to be the origin of stupendous wreaths of stars, is to be met within its circuit. There are other objections to the theory, recently discussed by Mr. Sutton with much good sense and ability (*Knowledge*, March 1891) in an essay which will repay perusal.

**The Ring Nebula in Lyra.**—A faintly lucent ring, nearly twice as broad as the disc of Jupiter in opposition, may be seen, with a moderately good telescope, in the neighbourhood of the brilliant star Vega, or, to describe its situation more accurately, about midway between  $\beta$  and  $\gamma$  Lyrae. Discovered by Darquier at Toulouse in 1779, it revealed its true shape a few years later to Sir William Herschel. It might be described as a "hoop of light"; only the hoop is not round, but oval, and the sky seen through it is not quite dark. The hoop, as Sir John Herschel remarked, seems to have gauze stretched over it. Moreover, this interior *gauziness* makes at certain times more show than at others; which is as much as to say that the filmy stuff within the ring *perhaps* varies in brightness. There is a good deal of evidence that a minute central star does so vary. Its disappearance, as that of a previously familiar object, was noted in 1800 by Graf von Hahn, who had mounted, in 1794, at his family seat in Mecklenburg, one of Herschel's twelve-inch mirrors, and used it not ineffectively. No glimmer of "Hahn's star" was again caught until the great light power of the Rosse reflector was brought to bear upon it; but Father Secchi saw it at Rome in 1855 with a twelve-inch refractor, and Hermann Schultz, with considerably less optical assistance, at Upsala in 1867. Nevertheless, it evaded recognition with the Washington twenty-six-inch achromatic in 1877, as well as with the still larger Vienna telescope

in 1885-6, although obvious, a year later, to the same observer (Dr. Spitaler) using the same instrument. The view, then, is at any rate plausible, that its withdrawals and re-emergences depend upon intrinsic fluctuations, and not merely upon alterations of transparency in our atmosphere. A photographic impression displayed it at Herény in September 1886, in the shape rather of a tiny circular nebula than of a true star; and this nuclear character was accentuated by the strength and distension of its image on a plate exposed twice for three hours last autumn at Algiers. Beyond question, accordingly, it is an integral part of the nebula enclosing it, perhaps the very foundation-stone of the whole structure, and its possible variations may find an analogy in the curious changes of aspect photographically demonstrated by Mr. Roberts in the nucleus of the great elliptic nebula in Andromeda.

The luminous ring in Lyra, although of purely gaseous constitution, is not of uniform brightness. Maxima and minima of illumination mark the extremities respectively of its minor and major axes. This peculiarity is shared, in some degree, by other members of the same class. It is neither accidental nor individual; and hence teaches all the more forcibly the lesson that the oval shape of the nebula, emphasised as it is by physical diversity, is a genuine reality. The ring is not a circle thrown into perspective, but is constructed and exists in space in elliptical form. At the elongated ends, besides, where the light is faintest, singular effusions of nebulous matter have been both seen and photographed. An escape of stuff, which the central power is inadequate to hold, is plainly in progress. And the escape, still more remarkably, takes very nearly the course which it should take if it occurred through the influence of attractive masses situated in the direction of the major axis. The conjecture is irresistible that the nebula is oval *because* of its vicinity to such masses. Nor need we despair of the verification of this conjecture. Sidereal astronomy has only just begun to develop its resources; and it commands the boundless zeal of a little army of votaries in all parts of the world.

---

## Notes of Travel and Exploration.

---

**Growth of Sea-borne British Commerce.**—Sir J. Colomb, in the debate on the Navy Estimates on March 2, gave some interesting figures of the growth of the maritime trade of the United Kingdom during the present century. The position of the country is revolutionised by the bare fact that its food supply is now mainly drawn from overseas, while the area of danger to commerce, formerly confined

practically to the Atlantic and European waters, is now co-extensive with the globe. The commerce to be protected in our last great war was wholly and solely that of the United Kingdom, and the naval estimates were then £22,000,000, although we had asserted the supremacy of the seas ten years before, and had then only the germs of an outlying empire to defend. This year, with an immense empire, and the greatest sea-trade the world has ever known, the estimate was only £14,000,000. In 1837, again, the revenue of the United Kingdom was £56,000,000, and the sea commerce only about £155,000,000. Now the revenue is £89,000,000, and the sea commerce £744,000,000. The aggregate revenue of the outlying portion of the empire, which was then only £23,000,000, is now £105,000,000, and the sea trade then £23,000,000 is now £460,000,000; so while the revenue of the United Kingdom has, during the present reign, increased only one and a half times, that of the outlying empire has increased fivefold, and while the sea-trade of the former has increased only five times, that of the latter has increased twentyfold. He then showed that the sea commerce of the Northern States of America when the *Alabama* began her operations, was less by many millions than that of the three great self-governing colonies of Great Britain, while the sea-trade of the other dependencies of the empire is not far short of double that of the Northern States at that period, exceeded by the present commerce of Australia alone.

**Relative Trade of the Mother Country and the Colonies.**—He went on to divide the colonial trade into two parts: that with the United Kingdom, and that with foreign countries. The amount of the former is only £187,000,000 a year, as compared to £273,000,000 for the latter. Comparing this figure—that of the independent trade of the colonies with the sea-borne trade of the Great Powers—he found that it was about four times that of Russia, equal to that of Germany, three-fourths of that of France, about two and a half times that of Italy, and nearly one and a half that of the United States. This foreign colonial trade is increasing every year, and the period is approaching when it will exceed that of the mother country. He pointed out that though it is all carried on under the British flag, the total contribution of the outlying empire towards the cost of protecting its enormous trade is only £381,546, while the naval expenditure of the United Kingdom is £14,215,100. India contributes for troopships and harbours £170,576, but for a sea-going force only £84,200, her total outlay to protect a trade greater than that of Russia is consequently but £254,776. Australia, it appears by the Estimates, has contributed £126,000, Jamaica £520 for a fresh water supply, and Ascension £250 for pier dues, while Ceylon, which contributed last year £4500, has this year disappeared from the accounts. Out of every pound spent for the naval protection of the empire in 1891–92, the outlying empire will spend but 6½d., the United Kingdom furnishing the balance. Comparing the aggregate revenue of the colonial empire with that of maritime Powers maintaining fleets for the defence of smaller commerce, he found its total

of £105,000,000 was one and one-eighth times more than that of Russia, two and a half times that of Germany, more than three-quarters that of France, about four and a half times that of Italy, and about one and a half times that of the United States. Yet while these countries expend from 3 to 8 per cent. of revenue on naval forces, the percentage of revenue paid by the colonial empire is practically *nil*.

**Manica.**—The name of this district, about which so much has been heard in connection with the new British Company in South Africa, is used in very different senses. On a Portuguese map of 1889 it appears as a district of the province of Mozambique, with boundaries extending along the Zambesi from Shupanga to near Tete, thence south-west and south along the Mazae and Sabi river to the junction of the latter with the Odzi, then east along the Musapa and Busi to the mouth of the Pungwe. The district of Manica proper covers a much smaller area, consisting of a small triangle east of the Upper Sabi and west of the Upper Aruangua, with an altitude of from 4000 to 6000 feet. Umzila, who claimed to be paramount chief of this territory, received a Portuguese envoy, and possibly made a treaty with him in 1884-5, but if so, his action has been repudiated by his successor, Gungunhana, who has allied himself with the English. His vassal, Mutassa, the king or chief of Manica proper, inhabits a town consisting of a group of huts, surrounded by a four-fold wall with an outside ditch and narrow gateways. An English company in Barberton had, in 1888, purchased extensive rights in Manica from the Portuguese Mozambique Company, but the mines there are, according to the latest accounts, not very promising.

**British Bechuanaland.**—A Colonial Office Report states that enormous strides have been made in opening up and developing this country since the operations of the Chartered Company have made it the high road to the goldfields of Mashonaland. The railway already completed to Vryburg has been surveyed for immediate extension to Mafeking, and the telegraph has been carried on iron poles to the Makloutsi and the Tati, while waggon trains laden with merchandise and stores continually pass through the country to the new Eldorado beyond. Under these circumstances, and in view of the great interests at stake, the Report advocates a further annexation of that portion of the Protectorate lying south of Khame's land.

**Germany in South-West Africa.**—The colonial ambition of the Germans does not lead them to embark their capital in enterprises seemingly adapted for its gratification, and the Imperial treasury has had to come to the aid of two of the most notable, in order to save them from utter collapse. The State has thus charged itself with the defence of East Africa, and similar assistance has been invoked for the German colony in the south-west of that continent. This consists of Damaraland and Namaqualand, including Angra Pequena of brief notoriety. The opponents of the vote declared, in addition to discouraging statements about the record of failure presented by the history of

German colonisation in general, that the greater part of the capital spent in this particular undertaking had already been lost, and that future success was very doubtful where there were "no roads, no paths, no coal, no industry." The Reichstag finally voted a few thousand pounds with the understanding that no addition should be made to the forty or fifty police required to assert German authority within a circumscribed area, and that even these should be withdrawn at the end of a year, if the new German Company now to be formed should fail to show some more hopeful results. As there is, it seems, no money to be had for its formation in Germany, the capital of the original Company being gone, the idea is that British speculation may come to the rescue, and adventure into the mining and agricultural industries it is desired to promote. To the establishment of these former, there is, however, a formidable obstacle in the concessions of mineral and other rights already held by British companies in Cape Town, Kimberley, and elsewhere. There is, moreover, a standing dispute with regard to the rights of Mr. Robert Lewis, a British colonist, who has lived in Damaraland for thirty years, and holds a general concession of all mineral and railway privileges from the paramount chief and his headmen. His expulsion from Damaraland furnished just cause of complaint against the German Government, on whom the question of his restoration is now being pressed.

**The Siberian Railway.**—The Commission of Engineers, which has been studying the question of the future Siberian Railway for some time back, has, according to a correspondent in the *Times* of February 14, arrived at a definite conclusion. The line practically decided on will run from Minsk in the Urals by Nishni-Oodinsk, in the region of Lake Baikal, to Vladivostok on the Pacific, a total length of 4785 miles, nearly twice that of the Canadian Pacific. The total estimated cost, including rolling stock, rails, and all plant and material, is £36,765,000. It will be divided into six main sections, the longest of which is over 1500 miles in length, and these again into sub-sections. Its construction will be spread over many years, and General Annenkoff's proposal to complete it in three has been rejected, as calculated to impose too heavy a financial burden on the country. The engineering difficulties to be surmounted are few, the greatest being those caused by the spring floods of the Obi and its tributaries, but labour may be difficult to obtain in some of the almost uninhabited regions through which it will pass. Part of the country traversed is, however, that of the *Chernee Zom*, or fertile black soil, on which grain is already grown in vast quantities, and which affords pasturage to countless herds of cattle. The question of employing the Siberian convicts on the construction of the railway has been mooted, but is scarcely feasible, owing to the numbers of troops which would be required to guard them, and the extensive barrack accommodation that would have to be provided in consequence. The water system of the Amoor and its tributaries, the Shelka and Ussuri, covering a distance of 2413



miles, forms at present the principal means of communication between Eastern and Central Siberia. It is navigated by forty-two steamers, fifteen of which belong to the Amoor Steamship Company, and the remainder to private individuals. In winter, of course, all navigation ceases, and sledges then furnish the sole means of transport or locomotion throughout the whole of this vast region.

**Death of M. Camille Douls.**—The *Scottish Geographical Magazine* gives a sketch of the career of M. Camille Douls, the young French explorer of the Western Sahara, treacherously assassinated while making his way across the desert to Timbuktu. Born at Bordes, in the department of Aveyron, in 1864, and educated at the Lyceum of Rodez, its capital, he early became a traveller, as he visited the Antilles and Central America in 1881, and four years later Morocco, where he studied the language and habits of the Arabs during a prolonged stay. Having there conceived the bold idea of exploring the unknown western regions of the Sahara, he crossed over to the Canary Islands, and engaged some fishermen to land him on the desert coast near Cape Garnet. Thence, in the disguise of a Mussulman, he proceeded inland, and, shortly afterwards, falling in with some roving bands, he adopted their manners and religion in order to save his life, being subsequently treated as a member of the tribe. With these nomads he roamed over great part of the western desert as far as the tropic of Cancer, eventually making his escape over the Atlas to Morocco. Here, however, fresh dangers awaited him, as he was imprisoned by order of the Sultan, and only released on the representations of the British Minister. He came to London in 1887, when he spoke at a meeting of the Royal Geographical Society, and published a narrative of his wanderings in the *Times*. He began soon after to prepare for another journey, and left Paris in June 1888. Some time after, news reached France that a traveller, disguised as a Mussulman, had been murdered by his guides in the Sahara, between the oases of Alouef and Aklabi, about 560 miles south of Oran. There can be little doubt that this unfortunate explorer was M. Douls, who would appear to have reached this point by way of Tangier and Tafilet. His great ambition had been to emulate the exploits of René Caillé, who seventy years before had made himself famous by his exploration of the same desert.

**The South African Company.**—A correspondent, writing in the *Times* of December 27, 1890, points out that the great distances to be traversed from the Cape to the new stations in Mashonaland must tend to check for the present the development of the latter. Fort Salisbury, within seven miles of Mount Hampden, is 1677 miles from Cape Town, 900 from Vryburg, the point to which the railway is now complete, and 800 from Mafeking, its ultimate objective, waggon transport being alone available for the remaining distance. The only condition which would, under the circumstances, determine a large influx of population would be the discovery of alluvial gold in large quantities. For working the reefs near Fort Salis-

bury, a five stamp battery is on its way, and good results are expected, but the cost of transport will heavily handicap attempts at working them. The fact that Lo Bengula's concessions convey only mining rights and no title to land, bars, for the present, any agricultural settlement.

Thus the prospects of the Company would seem gloomy, were it not for a discovery that promises to open a cheaper route to the scene of its operations. The Pungwe river from the port of Byra, 380 miles from Mount Hampden, is found to be navigable for 120 miles of that distance for steamers of light draught, while a low-water depth of 8 feet at its mouth renders it accessible to vessels of considerable size. Merchandise can thus be sent to Fort Salisbury by this route at a lower cost than to Mafeking, the future terminus of the railway. The Cape colonists, however, who were induced to construct the Bechuanaland railway on the plea that it was to carry the traffic of the colonies beyond, look with no friendly eye on the prominence of Pungwe Bay as a rival to Table Bay and Port Elizabeth. Hence difficulties may arise between the conflicting claims of the British shareholders and the South African colonists. The Company has already spent nearly half a million sterling, and is consequently burdened with a debt of £25,000 per annum.

**The Kashmir Railway.**—The construction of the railway from the frontier of British India to the head of the valley of Kashmir has now been practically decided on, and only the protraction of the negotiations with reference to the guarantee delays its commencement. The line of route will be, according to a correspondent in the *Times* of February 11, from Rawul Pindi, with the largest garrison in India, 10,000 strong, to Srinagar, a distance of 210 miles, of which 78 will be in British, and 132 in Kashmirian territory. The amount of capital required will be from 250 to 300 lakhs of rupees, or from about  $2\frac{1}{4}$  to  $2\frac{1}{2}$  millions sterling, to be jointly guaranteed by the Governments of India and Kashmir, the Imperial credit being practically pledged for the latter as a feudatory State under special direction. A cart road, recently completed, runs along the greater part of the proposed line, the track of which the State Government wish to utilise for it. To this, however, the Indian authorities, looking to the inconvenience of its being closed during the period of construction, and the advantage of having an alternative line of communication, are strongly opposed. As a strategical route the railway will have an important bearing on the all-important question of frontier defence, as it will be available for the concentration of troops at the foot of a series of practicable passes leading from Central Asia. As a commercial line it will turn the flank of the route through Afghanistan, where crushing duties are imposed by the Amir, and will enable British goods to reach the heart of Asia duty free. Kashmir, a great land-locked region of 80,000 square miles, surrounded by snow mountains from 20,000 to 25,000 feet high, has hitherto been accessible only by mule tracks over the Himalayas; and the immediate result of the opening of the railway

will doubtless be to throw it open to tourists and holiday-makers, rendering it thus an Asiatic Switzerland. Hitherto the only accommodation for visitors consisted of bungalows lent by the Maharaja to the few English families who resorted here in summer.

**The Congo Free State.**—The visit of the King of the Belgians to this country in March was known to have reference to the affairs of the Congo State, and the position in which it has been placed by the General Act of the Conference at Brussels, the ratifications of which are to be exchanged on July 2. The tariffs to be imposed are formulated in the *Bulletin Officiel* of the Free State for February, and are as follows: 10 per cent. export duty on ivory if bought on the banks of the Congo, or 25 per cent. if purchased at a distance from the main stream; 10 per cent. on export of india-rubber; an impost of from 25 centimes to 1½ francs on every square metre of building ground, each story to be reckoned a separate house; 10 to 30 francs per head on servants, and 50 to 1000 francs on vessels navigating the river. The effect of the announcement has been a movement on the part of the Dutch and other traders to transfer their establishments to the Portuguese side of the river, while the Government of the United States has threatened to withdraw altogether from the Convention which sanctions these restrictions. The *Times* of March 20, in commenting on the subject, refers also to the aggressive action of the Free State authorities in sending a formidable expedition on a secret mission by way of the Mobangi or Welle, with the object, it is asserted on authority, of reaching the Bahr-el-Ghazal and annexing the Nile Valley in the king's name. As this would bring the Free State into collision with England on the one hand by invading her sphere of influence, and with France on the other as a violation of the agreement with her, limiting its territory to four degrees north of the Equator, it is not likely it will be persevered in. The expedition, which started early in 1891, consists of 300 soldiers, including a company recruited in Egypt; two captains, six lieutenants, a surgeon, and several non-commissioned officers, under the command of Captain Van Kerkhove, and its baggage forms 5000 loads, necessitating as many carriers.

**Exploration of the Congo Affluents.**—Important additions have been made to the results of M. Delcommune's exploration of the Lomami by the subsequent journey of M. Hodesteter, of the Upper Congo Company. This river, which falls into the Congo from the south below Stanley Falls, he explored, with a party of natives from Bangala, as far as the rapids, which bar navigation, and found it to be fed by numerous tributaries on both sides. The banks were thickly peopled, and the natives friendly, so that there was no difficulty in landing at their villages. The lower part of the river, with a width of from 1000 to 1300 feet, is crowded with sandbanks and islands, and the upper reaches are so obstructed by rocks and rapids as to offer few facilities for navigation. From the station of Bena Kamba, ascertained by him to be in 2° 50' S., he went overland to Nyangwe on the Lualaba (Upper Congo), and thence up that river

to Kassongo, Tippo Tib's headquarters, whence he retraced his way to the Lomami, returning to Bangala on October 13 without having fired a shot or lost a man. The banks of the river are thickly covered with forest, which, however, gives place to open undulating country in the regions between the rivers. The town of Kassongo has a population of 20,000, and round this and other populous Arab settlements he found extensive plantations of rice, maize, beans, and other crops.

To the north of the Congo again, Captain Van Gèle believes he has been able to fill the gap between the Mobangi and the Welle, thus conclusively proving the two rivers to be one. He reached the zeriba of Abdallah, visited by Schweinfurth in 1883, and his journey completes the exploration of this great northern tributary of the Congo for a length of 750 miles (*Times*, December 26, 1890).

**The Regions of the Upper Amazon.**—An English resident on the Upper Amazon communicates to the Manchester Geographical Society (*Journal*, January–March 1890) his views on the capabilities of that little known region. Here Peru, whose western half slopes to the Pacific, has, on the eastern incline of the Andes, that portion of her territory known as the *montaña*, including the upper courses of the great rivers flowing to the Atlantic. Iquitos, the chief Peruvian port on the Amazon, is the sanatorium of that country, and is described as far healthier than most English watering-places, though with the high average temperature of 82° Fahr. Its population, numbered at 1000 some twenty years ago, is now 8000, five-sixths of whom are civilised half-caste Indians, the remainder South Americans and Europeans. An active trade is carried on, imported goods being exchanged for india-rubber, and most European commodities are to be had at moderate prices; but, owing to the scarcity of fresh meat, tinned provisions are the principal food, and any one capable of rearing live stock would have an opening in supplying the town. Cattle, goats, pigs, sheep, and poultry are easily reared, the latter including a great variety of the wild Gallinacea, which abound in the Amazonian forests. Llamas and four-horned sheep are reared in some places, turtle are abundant, and the woods are overrun with the porcine tribe. Peccary ham, cooked Indian fashion in a roll of clay, is, according to the writer, a delicacy which justifies Humboldt's longing recollection as the only thing in the New World he regretted leaving behind him.

In addition to india-rubber, at present the principal article of export, the forests abound in valuable timber, aguana or mahogany, tortoiseshell wood, the cocobolo, much prized for cabinet work, and the huacapa, equal to *lignum vitæ*. Sugar-cane, cocoa, coffee, Indian corn, mandioca, and kidney beans are cultivated by the natives for their own use; tobacco is also grown, and cotton and rice might easily be cultivated.

Vanilla, vegetable ivory, indigo, pistachio root, mango, pine-apple, cocoa-nut, and a variety of other tropical products abound, including the marañon, or cachon, from which a delicious wine, with the addi-

tional recommendation of being a blood purifier, is manufactured. The writer believes that gold exists in large quantities, and has himself handled surface nuggets as large as hedge-sparrows' eggs. All the rivers descending from the Andes bring down large quantities of gold, but at present the gold washings on the Marañon cannot be made to pay, owing to absence of machinery and cost of transport. The Upper Amazon is accessible by two lines of steamers plying between Liverpool and Para or Manoa, whence the great river is navigated to Iquitos by the boats of the Amazon Steam Navigation Company.

**German African Expedition.**—News has been received of the result of a German exploring party of 250 men, sent under the command of Lieutenant Morgan two years ago, to investigate the districts of the Niger tributaries. They suffered from scarcity of food as they penetrated into the interior, and the men could scarcely be restrained from bartering their ammunition for provisions. After severe privations and much suffering from illness, they reached the Binue, where they were met by an agent of the Niger Company, who conducted them down that stream and the Niger to Akassa, which they reached diminished in number by 100 men. The expedition was composed principally of British subjects from the colonies of Lagos and Accra, as well as from the Kroo coast. It is believed that Lieutenant Morgan, in addition to his commission for geographical research, was authorised to make arrangements on behalf of the German Government with the kings and chiefs at the back of the great Oil Rivers, and that treaties may have been concluded with some. It would not seem that they have made any geographical discovery of importance.

---

## Notes on Novels.

---

*Mademoiselle Ixe.* By LANOE FALCONER. London: T. Fisher Unwin. 1891.

THIS fascinating little volume merits the success of a third edition by the brilliancy of the dialogue, in which the secondary personages are made to reveal themselves, as well as by the subdued tragic interest attaching to the central character. The contrast between the placid peace of English rural life and the stormy career of the foreigner temporarily introduced into it, is artistically suggested by her conversation with the young girl who complains of the dulness of a life, so rich, to the other's sorrow-seared eyes, in all

elements of happiness. The character of Mademoiselle Ixe, a Russian Nihilist, temporarily acting, for her political purposes, as governess in an English family, is redeemed by its lofty enthusiasm from the category of ignoble criminals, and the author is skilful enough to render her an object of pity rather than of horror, even after the fulfilment of her mission of crime. The strange influence of her personality on those around her, despite the absence of all external attractions, is also subtly realised. The tale, up to its culmination in tragedy, is written in the vein of light comedy, and an underlying sense of humour raises its sketches of commonplace life far above the level of the common. The scene in which Mrs. Cosmo Fox, the fashionable beauty, bustles in, voluble and vehement, disorganising in a moment the humdrum circle she breaks in on, is inimitable, as is also the dialogue in which the Russian dexterously turns aside cross-examination as to her creed by flinging the apple of discord of the Apostolic Succession between two clergymen in opposite camps of the Church of England. Every line throughout is artistically calculated to heighten effect by insensible touches, and every incident leads up to the single psychological instant in which passion culminates in action. The absence of all attempt at melodramatic effect heightens the impression which the reader's imagination works out for itself.

---

*Lady Merton.* By J. C. HEYWOOD. London: Burns & Oates.

THIS "Tale of the Eternal City," as it is called on the title-page, does not stop at the mere external aspects of life in modern Rome, but follows out its deeper meaning in the working of its associations and traditions on the minds of casual visitors. In one sense, this is more striking in the case of Protestants than in that of Catholics, for the evidences that are new and startling to the former are to the latter but the visible manifestation of already familiar truths. The mental experience of the leading characters in the tale is consequently that of many in actual life, whose reading, previously narrowed by sectarian bias, has not prepared them for the mass of testimony to Catholic truth now presented to them. The arguments which eventually overthrow the dearly cherished convictions of Sir Henry and Lady Merton are put before them, not by a member of the priesthood, against whom they would have been on their guard, but by an American traveller, himself an unbeliever, who uses Catholic truth merely as a lever to uproot the crazy foundation of logic on which Anglicanism rests. Of the only priest with whom they come in contact it is very happily said that he did not talk religion, but simply lived it. But although the purpose of the book is primarily a controversial one, it would be misrepresenting it to describe it as wanting in other forms of interest. On the contrary, it has a sensational plot, in which the heroine is undermined in her husband's affections by the machinations of a vicious



and intriguing step-daughter, while the brother of the latter, a selfish, pleasure-loving young Englishman, becomes involved in a series of tragical complications through his desertion of the beautiful Italian girl, his marriage to whom by the priest without the intervention of the civil functionary is invalid, according to the law of that country.

---

*A Born Coquette.* By Mrs. HUNGERFORD. London: Spencer Blackett. 1890.

THE author of "Molly Bawn" can always furnish her readers with a story compounded of airy nothings, and as free from the ponderous ingredients of the romancer's receipt-book as a trifle or an *omelette soufflée*. Flirtation in all its forms and phases, unadulterated by introspection, psychology, or any of the moral problems so laboriously toiled over by the conscientious disciple of the modern school of fiction, is her invariable theme, and her heroines as a rule belong to the class whom a strait-laced society would probably stigmatise as fast. But since the scene is generally laid in the more genial sphere of the sister isle, we may perhaps put down relaxation of social discipline among the privileges of a country whence conventionality is doubtless banished with political economy, to find a home in the remoter luminaries of the solar system. Having released ourselves from its thralldom, we may perhaps sympathise with the woes of the heroine, who, having insisted on accompanying a young gentleman in a *tête-à-tête* sail in his yacht, finds her cruise prolonged by a conspiracy of the elements to one of several days' duration. Under these circumstances, the tyranny of the *convenances* reasserts itself, and compels her to marry the partner of her escapade. As he is young, rich, devotedly attached, and sufficiently attractive to have enjoyed a considerable show of favour from her beforehand, we scarcely think she need have waited for the end of the third volume to become reconciled to her fate. A very happy hit is made in the character of Murphy, an Irish butler, whose peculiarities of mind and manner are racy of the soil, while his fidelity to the fallen fortunes of the family he is attached to are equally characteristic.

---

*Kirsteen.* By Mrs. OLIPHANT. London: Macmillan & Co. 1890.

IT is long since this versatile authoress has written a work so full of freshness and spontaneity as this tale of family life in the Western Highlands during the early years of the century. The household of the Laird of Drumcarro, ex-planter and slaveholder, furnishes a group of studies, each of which stands out with perfect individuality, from the grim paterfamilias down to Margaret Brown, the devoted and capable serving-woman, perhaps the most admirable

both in conception and delineation. The heroine, with her deep fidelity of heart, is a true type of Scotch nature, all the more strongly realised for the minor imperfections which form the inseparable shadow of strongly marked moral features. The unspoken romance of her life, the patient hope frustrated by death when near fruition, is all the more pathetic for the power of self-repression with which it is lived down. The tragic interest of this part of the plot culminates in her interview with the bereaved mother, from whom she claims, with an imperiousness that cannot be gainsaid, the last sad memorial of her dead soldier. Apart from this under-current of sentiment, Kirsteen's life is an eventful one, as she has to fly alone and almost penniless from the violence of her father in pressing a distasteful marriage on her. Her adventures on the journey to London, in those days a long and difficult one, are full of interest, and her career in the metropolis, where she finds an unexpected vocation in the development of a genius for mantua-making, is an anticipation of the latest fashion in feminine professions. The minor characters are true to nature in their varieties of commonplace selfishness, as is Drumcarro himself to the stronger type of character which carries self-willed egotism to brutality.

---

*The Prince of the Glades.* By HANNAH LYNCH. London: Methuen & Co. 1891.

ALTHOUGH the dedication of these volumes to Miss Anna Parnell implies nationalist proclivities on the part of their author, the course of the narrative does not seem appreciably coloured by political sympathy. The story of an abortive conspiracy, in which the peasantry, after careful drilling and discipline, desert their leaders on the first contact with the dreaded police, gives no exalted idea of Irish patriotism, and seems rather to point the moral of the hopelessness of such attempts. The story, apart from politics, is a romantic though somewhat depressing one, and is told with a certain grace of diction that lends colour to its details. The characters are, however, of an unattractive type; the heroine an icicle, who only thaws at the most inopportune moment; and the hero a semi-savage, with a nature warped by parental dislike. In his father, The O'Moore, we have introduced in the most unwarrantable fashion a well-known Irishman not long dead, whose identity is scarcely veiled under the title of the Prince of the Glades, while the fairy lake associated with his legendary family history is equally recognisable, though transported to the north of Ireland. As his fictitious alias is made a monster of vice, we must protest against such an abuse of the novelist's power of drawing from life. The writer, too, in introducing an Irish chieftain should have informed herself of the proper style of addressing him, which is by the patronymic alone, without prefix. Singularly as it may strike English ears to hail a gentleman on first acquaintance as "O'Moore," "O'Donovan," or "O'Grady," it

is a still greater solecism, according to their code of etiquette, to add the conventional Mr. to these names when distinguished by the definite article as the mark of their tribal pre-eminence.

---

*A Life Sentence.* By ADELINE SERGEANT. London: Hurst & Blackett. 1891.

IN the modern sensation novel, we are satisfied to concede a certain number of improbabilities and incongruities, in consideration of a fairly readable narrative of the startling events recorded. This Miss Sergeant has given us in her present work, and we are accordingly satisfied not to analyse too closely the details of the plot. We have here a variation on the usual ingredients of this class of fiction in a criminal but remorseful hero, who, having taken a man's life under circumstances which rendered the act to a certain extent justifiable, commits the far worse iniquity of allowing an innocent man to be condemned in his stead. The true evil genius of the book is, however, the *villainess*, if we may be allowed to coin such a word, who is in this case the hero's sister, Constance, endowed with the prescriptive properties of golden hair, velvet-brown eyes, and a feline disposition. There are, on the other hand, two heroines, the murdered man's daughter, Enid, who, in astonishing violation of the canons of taste, is allowed to become engaged for a time to her father's slayer; and Cynthia, the daughter of the supposed murderer, who marries the real murderer after he has made atonement by confessing his crime, and undergoing a term of imprisonment. Before this consummation is reached there is scope for a variety of complications and entanglements, including the attempted poisoning of Enid by Constance, the fraudulent substitution of another woman's child for her own by the latter, the development of Cynthia into a magnificent vocalist, and her success in nursing the hero through a brain fever in defiance of all his relations. There are elements in the story that suggest its capabilities for dramatisation, as it would afford scope for some striking situations.

---

*The Wages of Sin.* By LUCAS MALET. London: Swan Sonnenschein & Co.

THE author of "Colonel Enderby's Wife" has chosen in this, her latest work, to handle a disagreeable subject in unusually disagreeable fashion. Heroic vice may be tragical even if disedifying, but commonplace vice treated with abhorrent realism of detail is simply repulsive. Whether good service is rendered to the cause of morality by rendering it so, may, we think, be questioned, as any good effects of its treatment in this direction are counterbalanced by the evil of familiarising the mind with its aspects, however deterrent. Neither is the book pleasant reading from any point of view: the style is laboured from an attempt at smartness, and none of the

characters are calculated to interest the reader. The heroine is, during the course of the three volumes, engaged to two men in succession, and the close of the book leaves her obviously on the high road to marriage with a third. Such caprices of the heart or of the fancy may admit of excuse, but can never attract sympathy. The fascination which James Colthurst, the hero, or quasi-hero, is represented as exercising, is totally unaccounted for by his presentment. A man who to hideousness of aspect—for such is the impression the description of him makes on the mind—adds a painful impediment in speech, would in real life be heavily handicapped in the race for the favour of ladies. The modern trick of individualising characters by constant reference to some habitual gesture or facial contortion is carried by the author to a length which produces a sense of irritation, we had almost said of nausea, in the reader. The brightest picture in the book is the incidental sketch of a fashionable young lady, veiling deep laid matrimonial designs under an assumption of gushing enthusiasm of manner. Both her conversation and character are cleverly reproduced with scarcely a touch of caricature.

---

*Stand Fast Craig Royston !* By WILLIAM BLACK. London: Sampson Low. 1890.

WE cannot think that Mr. Black has been successful in his attempt to concentrate his readers' attention throughout these volumes on the character of a more or less conscious impostor. True, old George Bethune's frauds are of a comparatively harmless character, but we doubt if in real life they would have long continued so, and whether the solvent action of a predatory way of existence on the whole moral fibre would not have carried him over the boundary of actual crime long before his attainment of the venerable age at which he appears on the author's pages. The interesting granddaughter, too, who accompanies him on his travels, would hardly have remained so unconscious of the use to which her appealing beauty and opportune blushes were turned, as a lure to intended victims, or a buffer between her guardian and the unkindness of a ready-money-loving world. This young lady, Maisrie by name, is fortunate enough to inspire Vincent Harris, a wealthy and charming young man, with a devoted passion at first sight, and the romantic interest of the tale turns on his courtship of her, despite the obstacles interposed by hard-hearted relatives to the course of true love when tending towards such a very undesirable connection. The billing and cooing of the lovers is, however, subsidiary to the doings of the old gentleman, whose conversation takes the form of prolix dissertations on Scotch ballad poetry, illustrated with copious extracts. This peculiarity, combined with the slight moral obliquities alluded to, renders him a most objectionable personage, concerning whom the reader's sole feeling is one of thankfulness that he is included only in his list of fictitious and not actual acquaintances. As the leading character of three volumes of romance he suffers above all from *le plus grand défaut, le défaut d'être ennuyeux*.

## Notices of Catholic Continental Periodicals.

### GERMAN PERIODICALS.

By Canon BELLESHEIM, of Aachen.

#### 1. *Katholik*.

IN the January number of the *Katholik* I gave a full review of Father Gasquet and Mr. Edmund Bishop's work, "Edward VI. and the Book of Common Prayer," which for critical ability, learning, and extensive familiarity with German literature, both Catholic and Protestant, of the Reformation period, is really unsurpassed. Besides the fresh light it sheds on the origin and present shape of the Anglican Book of Common Prayer, the information which it gives us about the influence exercised by German Protestant divines at the very beginning of the ecclesiastical revolution is not to be underrated. A striking illustration of the quite Protestant character of the English liturgy as contained in the Prayer Book, has been afforded by the recent judgment of Archbishop Benson in the Lincoln case, about which I also gave a review. Father Baumer, a Benedictine monk of Maredsous, is continuing his learned articles on the history of the Roman Breviary. In the present one he discusses the changes introduced in the Breviary by Innocent III. and other Popes, and sketches the exertions of the Franciscans in propagating this modified liturgical book. The article is largely based on an examination of manuscript sources, and for several notices the writer acknowledges himself to be indebted to Mr. Edmund Bishop. Another article in the *Katholik* is concerned with the social congress held at Liège last year. Still another contains a review of the second edition of Professor Gutberlet's "Textbook of Philosophy." He is favourably known as the editor of the "Philosophisches Jahrbuch der Goerresgesellschaft." Professor Gutberlet's Textbook ranks with the best works in this department of Catholic science, and seems to deserve special praise for one particular quality, viz., the author's singular talent for examining into mathematical problems in their connection with philosophical questions. Of course the author is well versed in the schoolmen, but on the other hand he likes to propose the speculations of the ancient Fathers and the results of modern science. Whoever is conversant with recent theories of space, and the objections to the teleological proof of the existence of God, will be pleased to have here a Textbook which takes active cognisance of those and other momentous questions. Another suggestive article is "Leibnitz on the Study of Science in Convents."

By a decree *Urbis et Orbis* of August 15, 1890, the Holy Father has assigned March 28 as the Feast of St. John Capistran, that

eminent Franciscan by whose piety, eloquence, and miracles the efforts of the Turks against Hungary were gloriously overcome. An article in the February number of the *Katholik* presents a long array of notices gathered from mediæval sources illustrative of his wonderful success as a preacher throughout Germany. Indeed, this Franciscan friar may be favourably compared with the most famous preachers of any nation. Father Zimmermann, of Ditton Hall, Widnes, writes on the position of English Catholics under James I. It is with the Oath of Allegiance as tendered to Catholic recusants that he is concerned in this article, and he shows himself a champion of Pope Paul V., who deservedly reprovèd that oath; and he shows that the action of Blackwell, who supported the oath, is quite unjustifiable.

---

## 2. *Stimmen aus Maria Laach.*

The first number of this magazine for 1891 opens with a memoir of the late Baron von Franckenstein, who as a defender of the rights of the Church in the German Diet, and as a most pious Christian had won universal admiration; his somewhat sudden death excited deep sorrow. Father Granderath contributes an article on "Undogmatic Christianity," as the most recent form of Protestantism. Father Duhr sums up the result of recent historiography about Wallenstein. The Austrian general still has able defenders, but the number of those who are turning against him is daily on the increase, and the judgment passed upon him by such Catholic historians as Baron of Aretin and Frederick von Hurter, is becoming more and more the general opinion, adverse to Wallenstein, who was guilty of treason against the House of Hapsburg. Father Reissel's article on the Holy House of Loreto is interesting, both from the points of history and art. A brilliantly written article by Father Baumgarten dwells on the beauties of Catalonian poetry as represented by Jacinto Verdaguer and his "Atlàndida."

A most successful enterprise was started some years ago in Berlin, viz., the publication of the "*Monumenta Paedagogica*" of Germany before the Reformation, and as the Society of Jesus was devoted from its commencement to the Christian education of youth, and exercised to the time of its suppression immense influence in German universities, colleges, and elementary schools, it was natural that German Jesuits should have a share in the *Monumenta*. To the late Father Pachtler we are indebted for having contributed three volumes, "*Ratio studiorum et institutiones scholasticae Suisetatis Jesu per Germaniam olim vigentes*." They represent a good deal of German ecclesiastical history, and are also a contribution to theology, dogmatic and moral; for the various decrees of the Generals of the Society show that nothing was left undone to second solid studies, and that definite rules were enforced as to theological opinions to be avoided or to be sustained.



3. *Historisch-politische Blätter.*

THE January number of the *Blätter* contains a general survey of the actual condition of Church and State in Germany. Next comes an article on the relations between Tilly and Wallenstein in 1625.

Then we have an article on Franz Grillparzer, the great Austrian poet, whose centenary is about to be celebrated. The position he occupies in German literature, and the influence he exercised in shaping the currents of opinion, are dwelt on at length. His genius was brilliant, his language noble; but the matter of his poems was sometimes in conflict with Christian ideas. In another article I write on the valuable "Mgr. de Salamon: Mémoires inédits de l'Internonce à Paris pendant la Révolution 1790-1801. Publiés par l'abbé Bridier, Paris, 1890." It was in the month of June 1890, when transcribing in the Archives nationales and the Bibliothèque de la Sorbonne at Paris, the names of the Irish procurators of the German nation in the old University of Paris, since printed in vol. ii. pp. 735-742 of my "History of the Catholic Church in Ireland" (Mainz 1890), that I became acquainted with the memoirs of Mgr. de Salamon, so full of stirring interest. Dr. Braig, parish priest of Wildbad, Württemberg, one of our most thoughtful Catholic writers in Germany, contributes an extremely judicious article: "A Chapter of Apology. The Development of Thought (mind) according to French Monism." The acquaintance we make with a philosophy which degraded man and saps the foundations of society is exceedingly saddening and painful. A German Dominican Father, P. Scheer, some months ago delivered a course of lectures in Christiania, Norway, on the Catholic Church, which excited considerable public interest, and brought home to many Protestant truths of the first importance, kept out of sight by their own pastors. The result was that the learned Norwegian divine, Dr. Krogh-Tønning, came forward with a brilliant pamphlet on the Catholic Church, to whose sanctity, vitality, zeal, and beauty, he pays the most solemn tribute. Other articles in this magazine deal with the biography of Cardinal de Bonnechose, Archbishop of Rouen, by Mgr. Besson, and the life of the late Cardinal Simor, Archbishop of Gran.

4. *Zeitschrift für katholische Theologie (Innsbruck).*

Father Stentrup has an article on "Atheism and the Social Question." Professor Schmid writes on the definition and nature of Quantity, and F. Emil Michael reviews Professor Sdralek's book, "Altmann von Passau und Gregor VII."

## ITALIAN PERIODICALS.

*La Civiltà Cattolica*, 6 Decembre, 1890; 3 Gennaio, 7 Febbraio, 1891.

**Cantù's Universal History.**—These three articles are devoted to some observations on the tenth edition of Cesare Cantù's voluminous "Universal History," recently published at Turin, and now brought down to quite present times—viz., near to 1885. It has been entirely revised by its author, a marvellous achievement for a man past eighty, but executed with all the vigour of youth. It must therefore be regarded as the latest expression of the illustrious historian's views and opinions. The reviewer gives to this great work, which has won for itself a European reputation, all the credit it so richly deserves. It is imbued with a spirit truly religious and Catholic, for Cantù is a faithful son of the Church, as his own solemn protest of entire submission of all he has written to her judgment would alone sufficiently prove, were it not also abundantly manifested in so many of his admirable pages. This being the case, it is only the more to be regretted that any blemishes should detract from its merit in Catholic eyes, and it would be highly desirable that they should be corrected. It would be almost a miracle indeed if a work containing near upon 9000 pages was quite free from faults. Cantù, with that modesty which belongs to great minds, never presumed that it could be so, and has always shown himself willing in each successive edition to adopt corrections which might be addressed to him, and which he had himself solicited. The reviewer, therefore, desires to point out briefly some of the most conspicuous in this last edition, confining himself strictly to the religious and moral order. As this brief notice, however, is spread over the pages of three long articles, it would be clearly impossible for us to give any adequate idea of it. The matter for censure has been divided into two categories: (1) The Popes: to rectify erroneous statements concerning some of them; and (2) Catholic Doctrines: to point out, as needing correcting, faulty language, or inexact expressions in questions of theology.

It is truly surprising to find Cantù accepting certain calumnious assertions which were once current, but have long failed to satisfy a juster modern criticism, or stand before fuller historic research. We must be contented with giving a single instance from category (1) It shall be taken from that deplorable time in the tenth century, when Rome and the Papacy were suffering from the tyranny of the Alberici, Marozias, and Theodoras. Cantù adopts all the calumnious imputations of the historian, Luitprand, against the three Popes, Sergius III., John X., and John XI. It is true that Baronius was deceived by him, but at that date Luitprand was almost the only known source of information with regard to those most obscure times. Since Baronius's days, there has been much study and research directed to them, and many discoveries have been made which have placed things in a better point of view, and proved the worth-

lessness of the evidence adduced for blackening the memory of these Pontiffs. Muratori was the first to raise an indignant protest against Luitprand's *mala lingua*, as he calls it, and to unmask him, opposing the truly reliable authority of Flodoardo, Luitprand's contemporary, but unknown to Baronius, who was thus ignorantly betrayed into historical errors. Many other authentic documents have also come to light, which serve fully to vindicate the reputation of these Popes, and to demonstrate the mendacity of the man who collected all the infamous stories, fabricated by the enemies of the Holy See, and bequeathed them to posterity as history. It is, one may say, lamentable therefore to find Cantù giving credit to these vile and now exploded calumnies. In this last edition, at least, one might have hoped to see misstatements rectified which he had hitherto inadvertently admitted.

It is false that Sergius III. was ever Marozia's lover, or that by her aid he violently seized on the Pontifical throne, and caused vice and adultery to reign in the chair of Peter. It is also false that John X. was the lover of either of the Theodoras, whether the elder or the younger. It is false that John XI. was the offspring of an adulterous connection between Marozia and Sergius III. Marozia, indeed, was his mother, but he was the legitimate fruit of her marriage with Albericus I. It is false that, being elevated to the Papacy, he abandoned himself to the indulgence of youthful passions, leaving everything, whether sacred or profane, under the control of his mother and brother. On the contrary, authentic history asserts that all these three Popes were irreproachable in their lives, and the first two even merited the encomium of their contemporaries for their virtues and their deeds. If John XI. was in temporal affairs hampered by the unjust sway of Marozia and Albericus II., nevertheless he filled the part of Pontiff laudably in sacred matters. *Vi vacuus, splendore carens, modo sacra ministrans*, is Flodoardo's written testimony of him.

Space fails us to select even one of the instances in Category 2 of theological inaccuracy and misstatement. In some respects, these are still more to be lamented than the historical injustice done to different Popes. The reviewer wishes Cantù yet many years of life and strength, and, if God should grant them to him, we may hope to see the imperfections removed and important rectifications effected in a future edition, so as to make this splendid work redound yet more to the fame of the author, and provide a more thoroughly reliable textbook of history for the use of the Catholic laity of this and of future generations.

---

6 Decembre, 1890 ; 17 Gennaio, 1891.

**Pontificate of St. Gregory the Great.**—In the last quarter we have the continuation of several series already commenced, amongst them one on the Pontificate of St. Gregory the Great,

viewing it in its connection with the progress of Christian civilisation. The relations between the Papacy and the Roman Emperor who, though virtually Byzantine, still retained the imposing claim and title of Roman, are admirably elucidated in these articles, which throw much light on the holy Pontiff's behaviour towards him, a behaviour at once most deferential and conciliating; his condescension, however, being clearly limited by obedience to God's law above all things. It was no adulation or exaggeration in Gregory to call the Emperor *serenissimus dominus rerum*, to whom God had committed *potestas super omnes homines*, for indeed the whole world, according to his belief and the ancient Christian tradition, was committed by the Most High Himself to the temporal ruler of the Eternal City, the Emperor of Rome. The imperial dignity, however, consisted in this, that it was ordained for the protection of the Universal Church, and by its action and the exercise of its power to promote its well-being. It was the same idea which filled the mind of Gregory as in later years animated Leo III. when he set the imperial crown on the head of Charlemagne, in order to renew and consecrate in his person the office and charge which had been forfeited by the degenerate Eastern Emperors. The interests of the Church of Christendom were considered to be intimately united with the prosperity of the Empire. In it was established a unity in the civil and temporal order, even as under the Successor of Peter unity was maintained in the superior spiritual order. The Emperor was the consecrated protector, defender, and champion of Holy Church, and, as such, was treated with exceptional honour. It was a grand idea, had it been faithfully carried out, and had not the ambition, rivalries, vices, and greed of Christian monarchs constantly defeated its glorious practical aim. The prayers to be found in all ancient Liturgies for the Roman Emperor bear testimony to the degree in which this idea clung to the mind of the Church; and so long as a shadow and semblance of the "Holy Roman Empire" existed, these were still in use. Our own missals bear witness thereto in their Good Friday petitions, but this peculiar prayer having lost its meaning, is of course now omitted.

The relations of the Church with the Empire are by no means the only subject of interest which the reader will find illustrated in these excellent papers.

---

17 Gennaio, 7 Febbraio, 1891.

**Opinions of an American on Italy.** — The question of the present and future of Italy is very ably and graphically treated in these articles through the vehicle of a supposed dialogue between three travellers casually meeting in the coffee-room of an hotel. The trio consists of a Piedmontese Liberal, a "clerical," as the former would style him, that is, a good Catholic, and an American Protestant. The unprejudiced and common-sense views of this

foreigner are very telling. Nothing, perhaps, would lend itself better to the object in view, namely, the arriving at sound conclusions on the topic under consideration, than the conversational form, which imparts an animation and actuality lacking in dry statements. We must be content with making one quotation, which sums up the opinion of the New World Republican as to the freedom enjoyed by "emancipated Italy": "And your republican monarchies or monarchical republics, do not they, in point of fact, resolve themselves into a state of tyranny, differing little from the autocratic rule of the Cossack or the Mussulman? The democratic form with you always covers an oligarchy, which, either by cunning or by violence, imposes upon the people, in the name of liberalism, its *sic volo, sic jubeo*, and the people are subject to it no more and no less than the Muscovites are to the ukases of the Czar, or the Turks to the orders of the Sultan. If you except England, which is rather an aristocratic Republic, no country of Europe properly enjoys any small amount of popular liberty resembling our democratic liberty. Practically, your liberalism is but a net of laws, oppressive of all freedom, individual, domestic, civil, educational, and religious, enacted by the few to the detriment of all. Hence proceeds the deep corruption in which political art and the science of government are made to consist with you."

---

21 Febbraio, 1891.

**A Fall of Manna.**—Amongst the many curious natural phenomena recorded during the late remarkable year was a fall of so-called *manna* in the neighbourhood of Diabeker in Asiatic Turkey. It was eatable, and, unlike the manna of Scripture, did not dissolve in the sun or corrupt, so much so that it was possible for the pharmacy of Bagdad to send a specimen to Paris. The botanists recognised in it a vegetable of the family of the lichens, called *Leucanona esculenta*. It is said to grow abundantly on the arid mountains in the deserts of Tartary. A similar fact is stated to have occurred in the year 1828 in Persia. The obvious explanation seems to be that, as this substance came along with a rainfall, a violent gust of wind sweeping over those mountainous heights had severed these plants from their roots, whirling them away, as we see in the case of dust or leaves, and then, with the cessation of the hurricane in a downfall of heavy rain, had deposited them in the spot where they were found. Some incredulous spirits are sure to seize on this fact as a possible natural explanation of an Old Testament miracle. The Hebrews in the desert, they will say, were thus nourished. There was no miracle at all in the circumstance. Such discoveries are hailed with triumph by a certain school. But, supposing we were to grant the fact, which, however, could hardly be granted in the face of the different substantial qualities of the two deposits, would there, we may ask, have been no miracle in the case? A

much greater one, we fancy, than the direct manufacture of the manna by angelic ministry would imply; for we must suppose a production of lichens so abundant as daily to feed three millions of persons for forty consecutive years—this multitude, moreover, being in a perpetual wandering state—and yet always finding a supply of lichens conveniently laid out every morning, wherever they might happen to be, and in a quantity precisely proportioned to their needs. We must confess, says the reviewer, that this *natural* explanation supposes too many miracles. Let us be contented with the one recorded in Scripture, which, it is true, is a miracle, but not an absurdity, or a group of absurdities.

Another extraordinary occurrence in the natural order is worthy of mention, namely, a rain of blood which fell in Italy at Missignadi, a village not far distant from Oppido Mamertina, on May 15, the Feast of the Ascension. What is remarkable in this fall is that minute chemical analysis has proved it to be *bond fide* blood, at least to exhibit its characteristics. The red colour of rain or snow has been found, on some former similar occasions, to have been seemingly imparted by certain cryptogamous plants, or some mineral substances. And hence the general conclusion entertained that the showers of blood recorded by our forefathers, and “credulously” supposed by them to be so, were, in point of fact, all explicable in like manner. This recent analysis goes far to prove that in this respect we may do them wrong. In the present instance, however difficult it may be to explain the phenomenon, it is to all appearance a question of real blood, not of tinted water.

---

**The Anglo-Benedictine Congregation.**—The following paragraph announcing the Holy Father's Apostolical Letter for the reconstitution of the Anglo-Benedictine Congregation shows also what is understood to be its practical object: “To the Benedictines England is indebted for her earliest Christian civilisation. From St. Augustine, first Archbishop of Canterbury, down to our days these monks never ceased spreading the light of the Gospel in that island, founding also those magnificent institutions, which have even been preserved by Protestants, though diverted to other ends. Now these illustrious monks, to whom the whole of Western Christianity owed so much, being suppressed in England by the pretended reform of the sixteenth century, had to take the road of exile, and could no longer penetrate into their country save as missionaries. All this could not but turn to the prejudice of religious discipline. Leo XIII., by his Apostolic Letter of November 12, 1890, *Religiosus Ordo*, has undertaken the work of restoring the Anglo-Benedictine Congregation to its ancient regularity (*decoro*).”

---



## Notices of Books.

---

*Life and Writings of Sir Thomas More, Lord Chancellor of England and Martyr.* By the Rev. T. E. BRIDGETT, C.S.S.R. London: Burns & Oates; New York: Catholic Publication Society Co. 1891.

IN completeness, in painstaking exactness, and in clearness, this *Life* of the Blessed Thomas More is equal to that which the eminent author has already given us of Blessed John Fisher. In general and popular interest it excels that biography. There are many to whom the figure of Fisher is one of the most striking and pathetic in English history. But to the general reader he will never be as popular as the wonderfully cultured, the large-minded, the witty and genial Londoner and lawyer, whom a strange dispensation of Providence led on to the crown of martyrdom and has raised to the honours of the saints.

In this very acceptable volume, which consists of some 450 pages with an Appendix and Chronological Tables, Father Bridgett mainly follows the order of time. We have chapters entitled "Childhood," "Youth," "Choice of a State of Life," "Early Manhood," "Secretary and Privy Councillor," "Chancellor," "First Troubles," and so on to the "Trial," and the "Martyrdom." But the author occasionally interrupts himself to dwell somewhat more at length on certain aspects of More's life; and thus, not far from the beginning of the volume, there are such headings as "Personal," "Professional," "Literary," and "Domestic," under which the innumerable anecdotes which are connected with Sir Thomas More's name are classified and reproduced. Besides this, the literary side of the holy martyr's career is very fully and carefully considered, his writings are analysed, cited extensively, and to some extent "apologised" for—that is, justified and explained.

This is the first *Life* of More which has embodied in its narrative the recent discovery made by Mr. W. Aldis Wright, which has added two years to the age formerly ascribed to him. He was born in 1478, not in 1480, as commonly set down; and he was, therefore, fifty-seven years old at the time of his execution. It is one of the great excellences of Father Bridgett's volume that he thoroughly investigates every question of name, place, and date.

Nothing can exceed the beauty and charm of the character of this great Englishman as we follow its development in this biography. In his childhood he lived in the household of Cardinal Morton, and as a child his brightness, good-temper, and versatile power made the Cardinal prophesy that he would be "a marvellous man." At Oxford he lived the hard life of a poor scholar; but he learned everything there was to be learnt, became one of the most brilliant Latinists of his age

(the age of Erasmus), knew Greek as well as he knew English, and made himself no mean versifier and musician. At New Inn, when studying for the law, he applied his whole mind to exercises of piety, watching, fasting, and praying, and thinking deeply and anxiously whether he was called to the priesthood. For four years he lived amongst the Carthusians, dwelling near the Charterhouse, frequenting the company of the heroes who were in later years to suffer so gloriously. He was one of the handsomest men of his time and country. His face—familiar to us in his well-known portraits—was of that healthy pallor, faintly suffused with the flush of life, which so well suits a refined and intellectual character. With dark hair and pale blue eyes, he had a countenance formed for mirth and humour. As to food, he was utterly indifferent. "He seems born and framed for friendships," says Erasmus, "and is a most faithful and enduring friend." In society his sweet and polished manners cheered the saddest hearts. As he grew older, the buoyant humour of his youth became more quiet and reserved; but his gentle, genial jests ceased not, even on the scaffold itself.

Although every slightest record and story connected with such a man is interesting, yet it is his noble fight for conscience, and the laying down of his life in defence of the supremacy of the Holy See, which naturally must always be read with the greatest attention and reverential enthusiasm. Father Bridgett has given us an authentic and striking narrative of all that happened from the year 1534, when his troubles began in connection with the king's marriage to Anne Boleyn, to the fatal but hallowed 6th of July in the following year, when he laid down his head on the block on Tower Hill.

An admirable account of the sources of the history of the holy martyr is given in the Preface. Father Bridgett tells us that his first anxiety in writing *More's Life* has been to state nothing he did not believe, and to accept nothing for which he had not historical evidence. With this view he has collated all the biographies already in existence, of the principal of which he gives a list and description. Of these, Stapleton's *Latin Life*, published at Douai in 1588, is considered by him to be by far the best. Stapleton, in fact, was intimate with Dr. John Clements, *More's* favourite scholar, with Margaret Gigs his wife (an adopted daughter of *More's*), with John Harris, *More's* secretary, and with others who well knew Margaret Roper and William Rastell. It is to the care with which men like Stapleton, Rastell, and Roper collected every tittle of information about him that we know *More* so intimately. The portrait of his mind and character which can be put together from the numerous passages in which his friend Erasmus speaks of him is most valuable and striking. Father Bridgett makes full use of all these materials. The book concludes with an account of the martyr's relics. It seems, from Father Bridgett's account, impossible to decide where his headless body was buried—whether in the Tower or in Chelsea parish church. Neither has it been discovered where his head lies. At Stonyhurst there are preserved his hat, his crucifix, his seal, &c. The Augustinian canonesses of Abbots-

leigh possess the hair shirt which he sent to his daughter Margaret the day before his execution.

*Acts of English Martyrs.* Hitherto Unpublished. By JOHN H. POLLEN, S.J. With a Preface by JOHN MORRIS, S.J. London: Burns & Oates. 1891.

THE memorials of Christian martyrs must always be precious to those of the Faith. The record of any struggle unto death for conscience sake awakens, even in the least courageous heart, feelings of admiration for such valour, and a desire to imitate in some slight measure the uncompromising service of such a noble soul. Those who here in England in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries were called upon to combat for their religion, seem so near to us in point of time and race that any addition to our knowledge of these blessed martyrs for the faith must ever be most welcome. It is for this reason that we cordially congratulate Father Pollen on the volume before us. To write history is one thing, to collect materials another. Both are equally necessary; but many will attempt the former who have not the patience and perseverance necessary for the latter work. It is comparatively easy and pleasant work to sit at a table well supplied with materials for book-making, to sort and arrange and weave together the whole into a story. To find the materials implies weeks and months of weary dust-hunting amongst records, which has been well compared to cinder-sifting. Hours, and even days, may go by before some precious fact well worth the labour turns up to encourage the searcher to proceed. Thus the labourer among original records must possess a fund of patience and a degree of self-sacrifice which in these days is rare enough. Father Pollen evidently has both of these characteristic qualifications to make him a good worker in the rich storehouses of our national archives. He has also what is, perhaps, a rarer gift, the self-sacrifice which has enabled him to publish the precious material he has gathered just as he has found it, without endeavouring to work it up into a consecutive narrative suitable to modern taste. This is quite what we want, but it is no less generous on the part of Father Pollen. As Father Morris tells us, in his preface to this little volume, the day is past when Bishop Challoner's delightful "*Memoirs of Missionary Priests*" are much read; and however much we may regret the fact that a book so prized by our Catholic parents and in our own younger days should lie forgotten in the dust of our bookshelves, we must now make preparations for a book that will take its place. After all, there is much that can now be added to what Bishop Challoner could tell us of the martyrs under Elizabeth and her successors. Many sources of information are now open to us of which he knew nothing, or to which he could have had no access. The first steps to the composition of the work which is to take the place of the "*Memoirs of Missionary Priests*" have already been taken in Father

Morris's works on the Martyrs, Brother Foley's "Records," the publication of the "Douay Diaries," and other works of the same kind. To these must now be added Father Pollen's "Acts of the English Martyrs." The material here printed is practically new, and has never been previously published, and it has been gathered together from various sources by the industry of the compiler. The Public Record Office, the Privy Council Registers, the Westminster and Stonyhurst archives, and other repositories of public or quasi-public documents, have been ransacked with a view to giving to the public what new material for the history of our English martyrs could be discovered.

The method followed by Father Pollen in his book is to arrange his material as far as possible in chronological order. This is the case with the acts of some fifteen martyred priests which are related in the first ten chapters of the book. The eleventh chapter is occupied with the new records of the martyrdom of ten laymen. The twelfth chapter gives a translation of Father Warford's account of various martyrs from the Stonyhurst archives. The concluding three chapters contain selections from unpublished papers from Westminster, Stonyhurst, and the convent of Englisches Fräulein at Nymphenberg in Bavaria. Of the two former collections Father Morris in the preface says: "Our volume pretty nearly exhausts the documents contained in them, supplementary to Challoner's work" (p. 13).

Each chapter is prefaced by a short list of the documents printed in it, and a note of the collection from which they are derived. If we should quarrel with Father Pollen at all it would be that he has not done as much as he might for that important person the "general reader." A little more editing, in its truest sense, would have cost Father Pollen very little trouble, and would have been a great help to most people. Throughout the book we constantly come upon little matters which a few words would have cleared up, and we should have much liked to see a biographical account of each martyr, however short, attached to each of their "acts." But this, perhaps, is unreasonable, and we are so grateful for what is given us in this little volume that we have no wish even to seem to disparage the work Father Pollen has done. One little point we may, perhaps, be allowed to name. At page 295, the date given by Challoner for the martyrdom of the venerable George Gervase, namely April 11, 1860, is called in question. The account, here first printed, gives the day of the week upon which he was executed as Monday. There is no doubt whatever that this is correct, as it agrees with a contemporary account in Italian sent at the time to the monastery of St. Pietro in Perugia, a copy of which is in the Record Office, and which we would gladly have seen printed also in this valuable volume of collections. But if Father Pollen will look we fancy that he will find he has taken the *new style* to reckon by. In that the 11th of April was a Friday, but according to the *old style* it was on Monday, and Bishop Challoner was not wrong in his date.

In conclusion we have to say, if, indeed, it is not already clear from

what has gone before, that for the history of our English martyrs this is a most valuable book, and we, as Catholics, owe Father Pollen our best thanks for the painstaking labours and self-sacrifice by which alone its materials could have been selected.

---

*Ireland under the Tudors.* By RICHARD BAGWELL, M.A. Vol. III.  
London: Longmans & Co. 1890.

THE history of Ireland is a rope of many strands, and it is only at a later period that the disconnected fibres are woven into a single cord of national continuity. The O'Neills made history on their own account in Ulster, while the Burkes in Connaught, and the Desmonds in Munster, and the English of the Pale had each their own sphere of influence, and a comparatively distinct life and movement.

The historian has to pass through his fingers these several threads of narrative at a time, and Mr. Bagwell's readers will close his last volume with the impression that he has handled the skein with no little tact and dexterity.

In these days of analysis, a work is estimated by the materials which have furnished the elements of its composition. Mr. Bagwell has built mainly from the State Papers and the Hatfield MSS., with sufficient recourse to Fynes Moryson's "History" and Hogan's "Hibernia Ignatiana" and other contemporary sources, to lend colour and relief to the structure. As to the historical treatment, the burthen of research can hardly have sat lightly on the author; but it will be felt that he has not allowed its results to press unduly on the mind of the reader, whom he has rightly gauged not so much as a historical student as a listener, and one who is not above the need of having his interest sustained by the plainness and succinctness of narration.

Then, Ireland is not a subject which can be easily handled in a non-partisan spirit, and probably Mr. Bagwell has gone as near to success in that direction as any who are likely to follow him. Readers who prefer history to fact-painting, and who feel that the study of their country's annals is, after all, something really more important to them than the knowledge of the personal predilections and tastes of Mr. Froude, will find it a refreshing change to pass from the drama and declamation of "The English in Ireland" to the sober and lucid pages of "Ireland under the Tudors." Not that the author has never betrayed his personal leanings, or allowed the reader to guess upon what side of the political fence the book has been written. It will be remembered that in issuing his first volume he vowed to act up to the modern standard of history writing, and to write "from the Bench, and not from the Bar." We took that to mean a promise of judicial treatment free from special or party pleading, and, upon the whole, the promise has been fairly fulfilled. But on reaching page 15 of this third volume one is haunted with an uneasy suspicion that it was possibly the Irish Bench that Mr. Bagwell had in his mind when he saw his way to give

the pledges referred to. Otherwise we should look upon the following passage as a clear breach of his articles :

The whole document [Desmond's declaration] is a good example of the sanguine rhetoric in which exiles have always indulged, and of the way in which leaders of Irish sedition have been accustomed to talk. The part assigned to Continental Powers and English Catholics in the sixteenth century was transferred to the French monarchy in the seventeenth, and to the revolutionary Republic in the eighteenth, and now to the nineteenth it is given to the United States of America and to the British working man.

The allusion, of course, is obvious: and it is a pity that Mr. Bagwell should have allowed this blotch of coloured ink to fall upon the otherwise clean, clear pages of his history.

It is, of course, possible that a work may be studiously uncontroversial in its style, and yet so constructed that consciously or unconsciously its ultimate weight and drift may be plainly controversial. It would be perhaps unfair to attribute to Mr. Bagwell's work any such motive or leaning; but if his presentment of facts could at all be said to point in one direction more than in another, it would be in that to which he himself has drawn attention in his Preface—namely, the apology for the Elizabethan persecution to be found in the fact that the Tudor Queen was the aggrieved as well as the aggressor, and that Jesuit missionaries and Jesuit political agents were not always so clearly distinguishable that a princess in peril of her crown could afford to discriminate, even if her wily counsellors and her rough-and-ready soldiers had been willing to do so. It might be not unreasonably pleaded that this drift of evidence is not the work of the author, nor due to any mere desire to play the game of set-off in imitation of a recent authoress, who found a companion picture to the Cromwellian massacres of 1649 in the Protestant massacres of 1641. Facts themselves have their natural direction—when those who handle them permit them to have it—and so taken they fairly fall in with the main idea of Mr. Bagwell's contention. Both the descent upon Ireland, and the Armada which followed it, were avowedly regarded by those engaged in it as a "Holy War." Such a war may have its martyrology, but it is not the one which to Catholic minds is the highest or the dearest. Time and light will bring to both Catholics and Protestants a calmer and truer view of such saddening chapters of our history. We, upon our side, ought not to be the last to hail such an eirenicon, and we owe it to its advancement, not to leave out of sight the provocation from without the realm, which went to embitter the persecution from within. In deploring the anti-Catholic fury of those who oppressed us, we can at least afford to bear in mind how far the element of self-defence may have entered into their oppression. We may also from our nineteenth century standpoint be sufficiently fair and frank to regret the unhappy conditions of mediævalism which warped the Apostolic See in the political movements of Europe, and in a manner forced the Vicar of Christ into the odious position of an ostensible enemy, and an abettor of the invasion of these kingdoms. History has its lessons, and posterity will learn them more fully than we do,



and realise more clearly the irreparable evils which arise to religion by such artificial complications. In doing so, it will be more indulgent to those who have created them than to those who by a traditional policy seek to perpetuate them even in the light of the age they live in. On the other hand, it must be borne in mind that Elizabeth's title was certainly not above question, even in her own country; and that her following even there could hardly be said to be the unanimous voice of the nation. In Ireland the greater part of the island lay outside of the Pale, and the dependence of the clan chiefs was often notoriously of a very nominal kind. That a Catholic people in such a position should resent an attempt made to deprive them of their faith; that they should consider Elizabeth's claim to their allegiance, urged in the same breath with Reformation statutes, in the light of a usurpation; and that they should eagerly welcome any prospect of help from outside to free them from what was both religiously and politically an alien *régime*, is not a state of mind which any one can affect to regard with wonderment or censure, and certainly, least of all, those who are ready to condone or applaud the analogous tactics of the Protestants of the same century at La Rochelle. To nickname such chiefs in Ireland as "traitors," "rebels," as Hooker does with fanatical shrieks in every sentence, or even to characterise them, as Mr. Bagwell does, as "leaders of sedition," is a mere misuse of language, which goes to obscure the actual historical relation and position of the two peoples at the period in which they are described. The worst that we can say of them is that they were acting according to their lights, and doing—*minus* the success—what religious leaders like John Knox, or popular leaders like George Washington, were able and willing to do, and have been popularly canonised for doing.

The first part of the third volume deals with the risings under Fitzmaurice and Desmond. War in Ireland is generally a drama made up, not of large armies or great battles, but of a rapid succession of short scenes of barbarous cruelty and bloodshed, preceded by conspirations, and followed by executions. A number of causes combined to stamp upon the struggles under the Tudors a more than usually distinct impress of this tragic character. The campaigns were long and tedious, and slowly fought out, and the three chief Powers concerned in them seemed to have joined in making them so. The Pope and Philip of Spain allowed an absurdly inadequate expedition to start under Sanders and Fitzmaurice, and then apparently waited for the timber of the Armada to grow before sending the half which was to follow to support them. Elizabeth, on her side, was very little better. Although the Spaniards were already in the land, and all Munster was slipping from her grasp, her parsimony was such that she would grant neither men, nor money, nor supplies. The letters of the hapless men who fought her battles are filled with pitiful descriptions of their desperate condition and their utter destitution and distress. And, last of all, the Irish chiefs themselves contributed not a little to the same result. They fought in sections, and seldom united in a joint or confederate movement. All these causes combined to produce that slow, simmering,

desultory guerilla warfare, which is fatally fruitful above all others in numberless episodes of merciless ferocity and wholesale slaughter.

What the ethics of war became under such influences may be gathered from the dispatches of Elizabeth's own officers. Zouch, who served under Pelham at the siege of Carrigafoyle Castle, says that of the garrison "there escaped not one, neither man, woman, nor child." Mr. Bagwell adds: "Those who swam were shot in the water, others were put to the sword, and a few who surrendered, including one woman, were hanged in the camp. Captain Julian (the commandant) was kept prisoner for one or two days and then hanged."

Maltby, another Elizabethan general, writes to Walsingham, and thus describes how he dealt with the garrison of a castle in Connaught: "I put the band, both men, women, and children, to the sword. . . ." The garrison at Smerwick surrendered at discretion. Arthegal, an officer in command, tells us what followed: "And then put I in certain bands, who straight fell to execution. There were 600 slain." Hooker adds that the famous Walter Raleigh was a captain on duty, and superintended the butchery. No doubt atrocities of this kind were often interwoven with acts of provocation or reprisal, but one can hardly wonder if such scenes have invested Elizabeth in the traditions of the Irish people with the unsavoury epithet which English Protestants applied to her Catholic sister.

The succeeding part of the work describes the fate of the Armada, and carries the reader through the eventful administrations of Perrot, Fitzwilliam, Russell, Lord Burgh, Essex and Mountjoy, to the close of the Tudor period. Not the least interesting chapter is that which deals with the Church, and with an account of which Mr. Bagwell closes his history.

The Reformation in Ireland was from the first a failure, and the Tudor establishment never was much more than a legal fiction utterly without hold upon the people. Elizabeth nominated Protestant Bishops to the Sees, but they appear to have been but mere shadows of the law, while the Catholic succession was, for the most part, comparatively undisturbed, and nowhere interrupted. The Protestant Archbishop Long, complaining to Lord Deputy Perrot of the condition of Protestantism in Ireland, asks himself, "But why should I name it a Church? Whereas there is scant a show of the congregation of the godly!" Another Reformation Bishop, Lyon of Cork, complains that in his diocese he has only three communicants. (To mend matters, the O'Donovans burned down his house.) Mr. Bagwell adds: "The 'devil's service' was the best of the many names popularly applied to the Anglican ritual, and the natives crossed themselves when Protestants passed, as if they were indeed devils." The popular estimate of the Queen's bishops was not a flattering one. Thus one "Barnaby O'Neill," who had probably a taste for portraiture in black and white, informed Captain Sidee that the Catholic Bishop "was noble, chaste, virtuous and learned, while the heretic bishops of England were shoemakers, scavengers, and pudding-makers."

Although the Reformation in Ireland left untouched the masses of the people, it made its appeal to the unstable and the unworthy, and naturally not without some modicum of response. Mr. Bagwell allows us to see that the Irish Church had its defections, but its Crammers were thoroughly characteristic ones. Miles MacGrath was Catholic Bishop of Down. He was deposed by the Pope for "heresy and other crimes." The Crown made him Bishop of Clogher, promoted him to the Archbishopric of Cashel, added Waterford and Lismore, and later on gave him Killala and Achronry. He held the Archbishopric of Cashel for thirty-six years, and died at the patriarchal age of a hundred. His case can hardly be said to have been one of promotion by merit. He was married at least twice. "He indulged immoderately in whisky." "He jobbed without compunction." "His diocese was found to be in a terrible state." "About twenty-six livings were held by his sons or other near relations." "More than twenty livings or dignities were in his own possession." (Sir John Davies writing to Cecil says that Miles MacGrath held seventy-seven livings, besides four bishoprics.) "The Archbishop's daughter or daughter-in-law enjoyed the income of two livings, in which the churches were ruined, and the cures not served!" "The capitular seal of Cashel he kept in his own hands, and used as he pleased."

When we remember that the personage thus described by his own friends held offices which would represent about a fourth of Elizabeth's Irish hierarchy, and for the space of nearly half a century, one can hardly wonder at the Celtic inborn contempt for the Establishment. The unfortunate prelate is said to have returned to the Church upon his death-bed, although the fact is as vehemently denied by others. At all events, in losing his faith and his virtue, he seems to have retained enough of his native wit to have left in his epitaph some sentences which, read in the light of his life, forms a terrible satire upon his patrons: "For fifty years, O England, have I *served* thee, in the midst of wars, and have been *pleasing* to thy princes." He appends the significant words which seem to fall in with the theory of his repentance: "The Lord is my judge. Ye who stand take heed lest you fall."

I may add that the volume is furnished with two very good maps, and that its utility is further enhanced by the excellence of its index. It is, I suppose, too much to hope that the superstition of issuing a book with the pages uncut will pass away in our own day, but it is some relief to find that the unpardonable stupidity of issuing one without an index is becoming daily of less frequent commission. In the work under notice, the error has been more than avoided, and the index, by its fulness and responsiveness, will make it a welcome instrument of reference in the hands of students of Irish history.

Under Mr. Bagwell's pen, the story of the land, in one of its most tragic and critical periods, has been well and fairly and clearly told. When his three volumes are put side by side on the shelves with Mr. Lecky's eight volumes on Ireland in the Eighteenth Century,

readers of the present day—especially those whose minds are turned to the solution of the great political problems which the events narrated have in no little measure gone to create—will be utterly without excuse if theirs is a zeal without knowledge in thinking of, speaking of, dealing with Ireland.

J. MOYES.

---

*The Christ the Son of God.* A Life of Our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ. By the ABBÉ CONSTANT FOUARD. Translated from the Fifth Edition, with the Author's sanction, by GEORGE F. X. GRIFFITH. With an Introduction by CARDINAL MANNING. Two vols. London: Longmans & Co. 1891.

"THE history of Abbé Fouard," writes Cardinal Manning, "unites the sacred narrative of the three-and-thirty years of our Saviour's earthly life with the living consciousness of faith." It is, with the exception of Father Coleridge's volumes, the only Life of Christ as yet published in English in which the attainments of historical science in our own day are pervaded by the spirit of the Christian faith. Anglican biographies, disfigured as they are by many heresies, are at their best almost invariably tainted throughout by the unconscious Nestorianism of their authors. Abbé Fouard's first sentence is, "The life of Jesus is an act of Faith."

The author, in his Preface, remarks that only in the Middle Ages did the Life of Christ begin to be written. The earlier heroic ages confessed the Lord Jesus by dying for Him, and the literature of the age of the Fathers busied itself mainly about His sacred words. The mediæval biographies are brimful of piety but lack erudition. The attacks of heresy and unbelief have called forth a deep study and wealth of learning to illustrate the life of our Redeemer, and in this immense strides have been made since the days of Tillemont and Calmet. Christian tradition is of course our chiefest guide: "no research, no science, however profound it may be, can supply us with what the early Fathers possessed—the actual world as Jesus found it, the self-same aspect of localities and affairs, and further still, their opportunities for daily intercourse with those of the faithful, who, having lived in the society of the Apostles, could relate their instructions." The resistless weight, then, of Christian tradition is the interpreter's surest guide, but that tradition has left much unexplained.

Of late years the East has been explored as it never had been; the Jewish writers have been accurately studied, tedious as the work has been; Egypt and Assyria have given up their long-concealed secrets. Abbé Fouard has put all these sources under requisition, and by following step by step the footsteps of the Saviour "from Dan to Beersheba," from Gaza to Libanus, has still further qualified himself to describe His life. In his own felicitous language:

We have seen the same world which met the eyes of Jesus—the cities, whose gates still close as soon as ever the first torchlight flares up in the

deepening twilight to dispel the darkness from their dwellings; the troops of dogs overrunning the deserted streets, still venturing to lick the beggar's body as he lies yonder by the rich man's threshold; the pomp and ceremony of the marriage feasts, the banqueting-hall, with the wedding guests reclining in purple and fine linen; the wail of the mourners, the clamour of their lamentations mingling with the shrill notes of their flutes; and as we enter each town we still hear the plaintive monotone of the blind man's appeal, while the leper still attracts attention to his malady by piercing moans; thence to the Desert of Jerico, the lonely track winding over wild and gloomy heights, where the Bedouin, gaunt and hollow-eyed with hunger, now as then lies in wait for the traveller who may fall within his reach. In the Gospels all these pictures are indicated in a line by a single stroke: it is only when viewed under the Eastern sky that they regain their fresh colours, in their clear native atmosphere.

These last words give us the reason of Abbé Fouard's marvellous success—a success that is the result of adding truthful picturesqueness to revealed dogma, the uniting of modern research with theological accuracy. We do not think he has by any means said the last word on controverted points, but in erudition we do think him to the full up to the level of any writers, Catholic or Protestant, who have as yet attempted the same task, while his reliableness in matters of dogma gives him an enormous scientific advantage over non-Catholics. Controversy, indeed, he has wisely relegated to foot-notes, and the flow of the narrative is unbroken by tedious discussions.

Still, the writer's decision on disputed points is briefly and clearly expressed. In his Appendix he pronounces in favour of the opinion that Christ anticipated by a day the Paschal Supper. In this, though he has against him such weighty writers as À Lapide, Benedict XIV., and Patrizi, yet he is in agreement with the oldest Fathers of the Eastern Church. Many of our readers will no doubt remember that Sister Emmerich, in her revelation, holds the view advocated by Abbé Fouard. We cannot better close our notice than by an example of the author's reverent and lucid weaving together of the text of the several Evangelists, and shall take it from the narrative of the Crucifixion.

The darkness disappearing, and with it the mists of fear, forthwith the Jews found courage to re-echo the words of Jesus, feigning to mistake the divine name of Eli for that of the prophet. "He is calling upon Elias," they said. Yet even by this gibe they confessed to the throes of terror they had just felt; for all Israel knew that the awful Seer was to reappear upon a day of terror and blazing fire, beneath cloud-hung skies and a moon like blood, when all the heavenly powers would tremble in their spheres. All at once another cry was heard. "I thirst," Jesus said, giving tongue to the most excruciating pain of crucifixion. One of the bystanders hurriedly dipped a sponge into the soldier's bitter drink and offered it to the Saviour; and as his arm could not reach so high as the head of the sufferer, he took a reed, set the sponge upon the end of its stem, and put it to the lips of the Christ. This deed of mercy drew forth a shriek of hatred from the mob: "Let be! let be! and see if Elias will come to save him!" "Let me alone!" said the man; "we shall see all the same whether Elias will save him."

*The Countess de Choiseul d'Aillecourt.* By Mgr. BAUNARD. Translated by Lady MARTIN. London: Burns & Oates.

A BRIEF but edifying Memoir of a lady whose tomb is in Orleans Cathedral. Adèle d'Astorg, Countess de Choiseul d'Aillecourt, was one of those heroic Frenchwomen whose childhood was overshadowed by the horrors of the Revolution, while the Christian tradition of their families made them pass unscathed through that epoch of Satanic impiety. She died in 1818.

*Peter's Rock in Mohammed's Flood.* From St. Gregory the Great to St. Leo III. By THOMAS W. ALLIES, K.C.S.G. London: Burns & Oates.

THIS forms the seventh volume of Mr. Allies's "Formation of Christendom." Whoever has not yet read these profoundly scholarly volumes has yet to make acquaintance with one of the most considerable and excellent productions of modern Catholic literature. Mr. Allies is a profound thinker and an elegant writer, and has given thirty years to the study of his subject—the divine organisation and the action of the Church in history—in its original records and in the writings of the Fathers, and the result is a work of the highest value to English readers of to-day, as an Apologia of the Petrine claims of the Roman Pontiffs. This, as Father Luke Rivington has made known to us (DUBLIN REVIEW, October 1890), was the very high estimate in which the late Cardinal Newman held Mr. Allies's volumes, and the estimate in which he himself holds them, as is apparent from his series of articles on them, one of which appears in this number, and still another is to follow, we trust, in our next. Under the circumstances it will be enough here—the special period with which the present volume deals being sufficiently indicated in its title—to make known by the following extract the scope of the whole work, Mr. Allies's *magnum opus* :

This work being from the beginning one in idea, I place here together the titles of the fifty-six chapters composing it. For each of these was intended to be complete in itself, so far as its special subject reached, but each was likewise to form a distinct link in a chain. The Church of God comes before the thoughtful mind as the vast mass of a kingdom. Its greatest deeds are but parts of something immeasurably greater. The most striking evidence of its doctrines and of its works is cumulative. Those who do not wish to let it so come before them, often confine their interest in very narrow bounds of time and space. Thus I have known one who thought himself a bishop accept Wycliffe as the answer of a child to his question, Who first preached the Gospel in England? And not only this. They also seize upon a particular incident or person, and so invest with extraordinary importance facts which they suppose, and which, so conceived, are convenient for their purpose, but in historical truth are anything but undisputed. In this tone of mind, or shortness of vision, that which is gigantic becomes puny, that which is unending becomes transient. The sequel and coherence of nations, the



mighty roll of the ages spoken of by St. Augustine, are lost sight of. Again, in English-speaking countries alone, more than two hundred sects call themselves Christian. Their enjoyment of perfect civil freedom and equality veils to them the horror of doctrinal anarchy, in virtue of which alone they exist. By this anarchy the very conception of unity as the corollary of truth is lost to the popular mind. But through the eight centuries of which I have treated, the loss of unity was the one conclusive test of falsehood, and the Christian faith stood out to its possessors with the fixed solidity of a mountain range whose summit pierced the heavens.

It has been my purpose to exhibit the profound unity of the Christian Faith, together with the infinite variety of its effects on individual character, on human society, on the action of nations towards each other, on universal as well as national legislation. Like the figure of the great Mother of God bearing her Divine Son in her arms, and so including the Incarnation and all its works, the Faith stands before us in history, *veste deaurata, circumdata varietate*. And as the personal unity appears in the symbol of the Divine Love to man expressed in her maternity, so it appears also in the figure of the Church through the ages in which that Divine Love executes His work. A divided creed means a marred Gospel and an incredulous world. I offer this work as a single stone, though costing the labour of thirty years, if perchance it may be accepted in the structure of that cathedral of human thought and action wherein our crucified God is the central figure, around which all has grown (Prologue v.-vii.).

---

*Manual of Church History.* By the Rev. T. GILMARTIN. Vol. I.  
Dublin: M. H. Gill & Son. 1890.

WE very warmly welcome this manual from the pen of the Professor of Church History at Maynooth. The first volume, which covers a good half of the Christian centuries, we have carefully examined, and consider it a most excellent text-book. Its appearance is also welcome, since, excellent as may be such translated manuals as those of Alzog, Darras, and Brück, an original work has advantages by the fact of its origin—the relative amount of space devoted to one class of subjects over another is determined by the actual interest in the writer's own country. Here we have an author of high ability who feels the same interest as do his English readers, and in whose work, too, due importance is given to points that belong to the story of the Church in these countries. Another excellence of Father Gilmartin's history is its practicable length. The present volume comprises 522 pages; another volume is to complete the work. It will therefore be a history long enough for ordinary classes; and not too short for a fair course. The author's treatment is clear and orderly, his style simple, forcible, and interesting. He shows thorough acquaintance with all the details of his subject, and manages to say a great deal in few words. Take, as an example, the famous case of Pope Liberius. Father Gilmartin gives, in less than a page, the whole pith of the question. Or, take such chapters as those on the history of "Confession," or the "Holy Eucharist," and the student will be surprised at the amount of information condensed in these pages.

We find very little to criticise in Father Gilmartin's first volume.

At page 504, however, there is a statement which will not find acceptance in many quarters—viz., that one of the chief causes of the decay of religious life in monasteries was “exemption from the jurisdiction of bishops.” How comes it, then, that reforming Popes have never taken away the privilege?

Having said what limited space allows in cordial recommendation of this excellent “Manual of Church History,” we add the hope that the author will be encouraged, by the success of the first, to hasten the publication of the second and completing volume.

---

*Letters and Correspondence of John Henry Newman during his Life in the English Church.* Edited by ANNE MOZLEY. Two vols. London: Longmans, Green & Co. 1891.

“IT has ever been a hobby of mine, though, perhaps, it is a truism, not a hobby, that the true life of a man is in his letters. . . . Not only for the interest of a biography, but for the arriving at the inside of things, the publication of letters is the true method. Biographers varnish, they assign motives, they conjecture feelings, they interpret Lord Burleigh’s nods; but contemporary letters are facts.”

Thus commences a work which, concerned entirely as it is with one of the most fascinating personalities of this many-sided century, it is superfluous to call deeply interesting. Much has been already written of Cardinal Newman’s life, acts, and feelings, yet to few readers has the subject become wearisome. If, then, as the only criticism of these volumes which it occurs to us to make, we suggest that a certain number of these letters might with advantage have been suppressed, the remark refers only to such as either were not written by himself, or which touch on the mere passing events in Oxford. These letters, which tell us absolutely nothing of Newman himself, we resent, seeing that they distract our attention from the main object of our interest.

On the whole, the editor has successfully accomplished her aim—namely, “to place John Henry Newman before the reader as he was to his family, to his friends, to his correspondents; as he was in early youth and in manhood, in public and in private, and in his action in and for the English Church while he remained in her communion”; and on closing the book we feel that, much as we already know of Cardinal Newman, we know him now far more intimately, and that of the Protestant half of his life little remains to be told. When, however, we say we know the Cardinal far better now than before, it is not that our view or estimate of him has been in any way modified or changed. Not at all; it is only enlarged and made clearer and more distinct. No former impression is in any way contradicted, nor is any unexpected characteristic for the first time made manifest. The author of Newman’s “Sermons” and of the “Apologia” speaks again, and speaks plainly, in these letters, and if, as is but natural, we miss in the days of his youth the rare beauty of style and the full richness and

versatility of thought of his later years, yet even the perfection of literary skill and the depth of religious feeling to which Newman eventually attained are more the development of early promise than the sudden acquisition of unexpected gifts. Throughout these volumes Newman's personality and special characteristics remain unchanged and are clearly discernible. We fail to discover any discordant note in his life, a perfect oneness and unity with himself reigns harmoniously throughout the whole. Under all circumstances he is found acting, speaking, and thinking as from our previous knowledge we might have anticipated. Genius is said to be eccentric, but from every shade of eccentricity Newman was completely free; and whether as a young man at college, or as a Fellow and tutor at Oxford, or as a preacher, and as a leader of a great religious movement—the same complete unworldliness and detachment of aim, the same hot zeal, tempered by tender consideration, the same surrender of his own self-will to those to whom his allegiance was due—show him ever as himself, and acting as we knew he would act.

Of the broad outline of Newman's life there is little fresh to tell; and of his inner history few men have left a more luminous and authentic memoir than the "*Apologia*," which has now been in our hands for nearly a quarter of a century. Perhaps the only positively new feature we discover in our study of this great man is the warm family affection which he entertained and expressed; a feeling which is beautifully portrayed in his correspondence with his father, his mother, and his sisters. The sorrow, too, in the family bereavements which three different times befell him, notably the loss of his bright young sister Mary, is very touchingly told, and further exhibits his affectionate nature.

A short autobiographical sketch, written in the third person, carries the story from his birth to his return from abroad, and to the commencement of the Tractarian movement; to the date, in fact, when he ceased to be a simple tutor and Fellow of Oriel, and became the John Henry Newman around whose words and acts interest centres. He had suffered from a severe and dangerous illness during his travels in Sicily, an illness which all around him seem to have felt assured must end fatally, but from which he, with almost prophetic foresight, persisted he should recover, as "God still has work for me to do." On this illness he has always looked back as upon a turning-point in his life. He has left a minute and vivid account of his fever, and all its dreams and weakness and suffering; and through the whole runs the conviction that in this illness he had received a call from God, on the direction of which he would hereafter be enlightened. Nowhere more than in this account do we discern how deep a subject of interest to himself was Newman. With keen introspection, he details some years afterwards all his experiences, his thirst and faintness, and the half-conscious, half-delirious thoughts that crowded his brain during his Sicilian fever, with the like power of self-analysis, and of viewing himself as if from without which he exhibits in a later letter in describing his outward behaviour when first introduced, in the common room at

Oriel, to Dr. Arnold. From his illness he slowly recovers, and a few months later he is back in Oxford, and the issue of the celebrated "Tracts for the Times" begins.

Of their oft-told history there is not much that is new to tell. It is a tale of high aims and lofty purpose, of disinterested zeal and devoted courage, all brought to bear on the sadly futile task of seeking to achieve the impossible, by squaring a circle—in other words, Catholicizing the Protestant Establishment of England. It is melancholy reading, and to us perhaps the most melancholy are the letters, the tone of which is both joyous and triumphant, and in which Newman wonders at and is gladdened by the wide spread of "Apostolic principles," as they were then styled. We feel so assured that his keen intellect will some day awake to the reality, we feel so certain that God will not fail to enlighten one so earnestly in search of truth, that we can hardly brook any delay; and it is almost with impatience that we read of Newman's satisfaction at the evidence that his new views are gaining ground, and that his teaching is leavening England, he being all the while unconscious that his labour is vain, and that he is but weaving ropes out of sand. The letter in which misgivings first appear, followed by distrust of his position, and ultimately by the complete collapse of his hopes of Catholicizing his Church, although very touching as delineating disappointment and despair, are not so saddening as the early letters, which are full of hope. The end, we know, must come, an end issuing in joy; and we can welcome the first sign of a change, although it is conceived in agony and distress of mind.

The history of Cardinal Newman's conversion to the true faith, which to our readers is naturally the most important fact in these two volumes, is but the likeness in kind, if not in degree, of the conversion of so many others, that to these it will come only as the record of their own experiences, at once both sweet and bitter, which are detailed with exquisite tenderness of feeling and felicity of language. Indeed, as long as English religious thought runs in its present groove, the second of these volumes will remain of abiding interest. Circumstances and characters differ, both in importance and influence, but, looked at broadly, the main incidents in Cardinal Newman's conversion are repeated day after day in the submission to the Church of many a humble soul, who is emboldened, perhaps, to follow in his steps because he had first trod them. As with Newman, there will probably be an awakening to dissatisfaction with early teaching and with the cold and formal Protestantism imbibed in youth. Then will follow, first, the vain hope that even near at hand, in the Anglican Communion, there are better things, and then an eager acceptance of a system promising the full grace of the Catholic Church, without the uprooting of past associations, the tearing asunder of domestic ties, the wounding of loving hearts; and for a while all goes well. Such peace, however, will be but short-lived. *Something* will surely happen, for each decade brings with it its own disturbing influence, either from lawyer, bishop, or

Parliament. In Newman's case, though historical study had sown the first seeds of mistrust, they might have lain long unfruitful, had not the opposition of the Oxford authorities been so persistent, had not the charges of the bishops been so unsympathetic and even aggressive, and had not the English State been so true to its Protestant instincts, and, at a critical moment in Newman's life, appointed an Anglican bishop to violate its own principles of the unity of the episcopate, and to fraternise with various schismatical and heretical bodies in Jerusalem.

To escape from so critical a position is, however, seldom the first step; and no one more deprecates hasty or ill-considered action than does Newman himself. For a time all is in suspense, and to him, as to lesser men, comes the thought, so strange and foreign to a Catholic mind: "That a great and anxious experiment is going on, whether our Church be or be not Catholic." As if we could experimentize with God's revelation of truth, or decide for ourselves the acts which are to uncatholicize His Church. However, both in his and in other cases, the end comes on apace. Either the experiment fails, or, better still, the true meaning of faith in the Church dawns on the mind, and it is realised that to believe and to doubt are not contemporaneous and compatible states; that no one can have faith in the Church and also distrust her; that to judge instead of to accept her teaching, is evidence that those in question have never actually believed in her at all. Then follow the arguments with which good men will tempt poor doubting souls, used, too, by Newman himself, such as the proof of God's presence with individually holy Anglicans; the rashness and presumption of judging for themselves; or the weighing of motives and the danger of being misled by the very greatness of the sacrifice contemplated. Then, to distress them further, will follow the affectionate pleading of attached friends, and none ever pleaded more touchingly than Newman's loving sisters, to whom he had taught so much, but who resolutely refused to be taught all—and then the final step taken at the last, exactly why and when it may be hard to say, except that all is in God's hands, and is done as seemeth to Him good.

And so end these volumes; which space forbids our dwelling on at greater length. The curtain has fallen, and to Anglicans the drama has ended in tragedy. We, of course, have only witnessed the first act, and shall anxiously await the sequel. For over forty years Newman's pen was used in helping others to cross the gulf which he had himself crossed, and in encouraging others to run a risk which he had run for a great gain; and we shall hope to obtain as full a knowledge of his Catholic letters as we have been allowed to enjoy of those written while he was still an Anglican.

*La Faculté de Droit dans l'Ancienne Université de Paris, 1160-1793.*  
 Par l'Abbé G. PÉRIES, Docteur en Droit Canonique de la  
 Faculté de Theologie de Paris. Paris: Larose et Forcel.  
 1890.

HERE is another instance of the dismal facts which meet us in the history of France: the fatal term of 1793. Then the old glories of the country fall into the abyss, and there is no recovery, except under new conditions, and no recovery is ever complete. The University of Paris was a great school, into which the youth of all nations flocked, and in which learned men of all nations communicated their learning to the youths who sat at their feet. In 1793 the cloud that had been gathering for a considerable time burst, and the deluge drowned the old Sorbonne and all that belonged to it, as well as the University of which it was so distinguished a part.

M. l'Abbé Périas has written the history of the legal studies in Paris, and has to confess that 1793 is the fatal term. That which the reformation of Calvin and Beza failed to bring about was successfully accomplished by the pupils of Rousseau and Voltaire, with the connivance of men who, by their position and profession, should have not only held aloof, but resolutely withstood the madness of the people. It may be true that abuses perished in that deluge, but it is quite certain that grand traditions of honour and nobleness were lost, together with the observance of healthy discipline and Christian sense, till then generally prevailing in France; for the theory was that the country was Christian, governed by the most Christian king.

The interesting work before us cannot lessen the regret for the old ways and the solid studies which the University of Paris, like others, fostered and even compelled. The history of the Faculty of Law by the learned Abbé is singularly interesting, and is well told, the fruit clearly of long and laborious research and of extensive reading. It seems that in Paris, as probably elsewhere, the Canon Law was taught by theologians as a part of the instruction expected from them. Undoubtedly it was their right, for law and morals must go together. But by degrees the principle of the division of labour showed itself, and the Canonists asserted and proclaimed their independence. They committed themselves to a rebellion, and formed a faculty, co-ordinate, if not obedient to the Faculty of Theology, and, like the theologians, were called "Masters." Innocent III. saluted the professors of the Canon Law of Bologna as "Doctors," and, according to our author, this led to another innovation, honourable and praiseworthy.

Until this time the professors of Roman or Civil Law alone were called doctors, and the title was apparently as much respected, and perhaps coveted, as a peerage is in our own day. The doctors certainly maintained that they were the equal of noble knights, and carried their pretensions with great fervour as far as they could. The act of Innocent III. caused a change; the Canonists called themselves



doctors, too—the Pope had so addressed them ; but it does not appear that they claimed to be the equals of knights; and there was no reason why they should, for their career was not secular, and ecclesiastical dignities were their distinctions and their rewards. The professors of the Canon Law, having renounced the title of masters for that of doctors, suggested a like innovation to the theologians, who were generally called masters; the masters in theology became also doctors, and have continued in possession of their title to this day without a protest from any one. The Faculty of Medicine was not unobservant of this change, and so the professors of medicine became doctors; but the Faculty of Arts, which is the foundation of learning, made no change, and the highest distinction in that faculty is to this day master, not even professor.

The Universities throughout Europe seem to have one tradition, never abandoned, even in modern times, after manifold reformati— occasional fits of turbulence. Lately in Brussels the students were so strong that they virtually deposed the rector. We hear in our own peaceful and law-abiding land of town and gown riots, and of very tumultuous commemorations. Our author is obliged to confess that in Paris also the youth who gave their days and nights to the study of Gratian and the Decretals, were not remarkable for the observance of academic discipline and a well-ordered life (p. 15). There were tumults in the schools, disorder in the streets; for learned men sometimes descend to the level of those whose disputes are settled by broken heads and maimed limbs.

Paris was a famous school; but our author is very candid, and admits that Bologna had a higher reputation. Possibly, some schools in France were considered more advantageous for the student than those of Paris, for we know that St. Thomas of Canterbury went to Bologna and Auxerre for instruction in law. The University of Oxford, in the twelfth century, set its face resolutely against the study of the Civil Law, expelled the professor, whom probably the Archbishop of Canterbury had brought over, and the books of law were consigned to the flames. However, the issue was not according to the desires of those who used fire as their instrument, for the study of the Civil Law continued and prevailed. It could not be otherwise, for the Canon Law could not be taught or learned without a knowledge of the Digest. It was even made necessary to attend the professor of the Civil Law before a man could be received into the schools where the Canonists lectured. It need not be said that the other branches of secular learning, such as grammar, logic, &c., were equally to be respected by the student who attended the prelections on Gratian and the Decretals.

Our author discusses at some length and with great moderation the supposed reasons of Honorius III. for suppressing in Paris the lectures on the Civil Law. It cannot be questioned that the Pandects exercised a surprising fascination at this time over ecclesiastical men, and had done so for some time, and that the Popes might be reasonably alarmed when they saw the clerics abandoning their proper studies for studies

not so necessary, at least for so many of them. M. l'Abbé thinks that the Pope was moved to issue his prohibition in order to bring men back to the study of theology, which was probably somewhat neglected in favour of that learning which was the direct road then to high ecclesiastical rank and dignity. But there was another reason, for, according to our author, the secular Governments of Europe encouraged the study of the Pandects because the civil lawyers were their most useful instruments in their perpetual rebellions against the Holy See.

It was not the wish of the Holy See to discourage generally the teaching of the Civil Law, but to check the abuse of it. That seems to be the reason why the Pope forbade it in Paris. "*Currunt enim illuc quidam improbi cum traditionibus secularium principium*," are the words of Honorius III., and they show us very clearly that the law was taught by evil-minded men, whom it was necessary to silence by withdrawing the youth from their lectures.

No doubt a like reason prevailed with Innocent IV., who was himself a great jurist, when he commanded—if it be true that he did so—the withholding of all ecclesiastical preferments from the professors of the Civil Law. These men did not respect the Canons of the Church, and were so infatuated with the Digest that they looked upon it as the sum of all knowledge and wisdom, even applying to themselves the term "*Sacerdotes*," and of the law they said it was "*Sacratissima*." Principles of this kind are dangerous, and they infected the teachers of the Canon Law, whereby came at last grievous disorders and irremediable troubles.

But it may be questioned whether the Pope even interdicted the study of the Civil Law. The Abbé Périès seems to hold that he did, saying (p. 95) that he extended his severe prohibition to England and Spain, where hitherto the study was lawful. Our author does not say on what authority he relies for the statement, probably satisfied with its uncontradicted reception. The story seems to rest on the credit of Matthew Paris, from whom Arthur Duck took it, and published it in his book on the "*Authority of the Civil Law*" (ii. viii. p. 2, 32). The Abbé does not appear to have trusted Duck, nor can his name be found in the index, which is an excellent one, and he must therefore have relied on Matthew Paris, or some one who put his confidence in him. It is difficult to believe that Innocent IV. should have forbidden the study of the Civil Law in France, England, Scotland, Spain, and Hungary, but on the condition that the civil power gave its assent.

This constitution attributed to Innocent IV. may be found in the great collection of Father Denifle, O.P., and the only authority for it that Father Denifle could find is Matthew Paris, whereupon the learned Dominican observes that he doubts its authenticity. Matthew Paris may have invented the story, or accepted it without scruple from an untrustworthy source, for he was a man of very liberal views, and certainly did not love Innocent IV. or any of the Popes.

Innocent IV. was distinguished for his knowledge of both laws, and

knew how much each contributed to the perfect understanding of the other; it is therefore not easily credible that he issued such a prohibition. Benedict XIV. says that in his day the study of the Civil Law was a necessity for the Canonist, though not altogether becoming a priest. His words are, "*Optimè novimus, studium juris civilis videri posse non omnino decere ecclesiasticum, sacris præsertim ordinibus insignitum, et tamen sedulo hoc studio non præmisso, neminem posse re ipsa fieri et agere advocatum*" ("De Synod. Diocesan." lib. xiii. cap. x. n. 12).

If this was desirable in the days of Benedict XIV. it was certainly not less desirable in the days of Innocent IV., against whom the Emperor Frederick II. marshalled all his forces, soldiers as well as lawyers.

We have not the time necessary for even the abridging of this excellent work, and we must come down to a later day, when the schools of Paris fell off from their original grandeur. The Parliament of Paris, which meddled in everything, somehow or other found a way to interfere in the faculty of law, and the Canonists suffered, were shorn of their power, and in the early part of the seventeenth century had become more or less the servile instruments of Gallicanism. Our author (p. 238) tells us that the civil lawyers were very powerful, and that their principles entered the school of the Canonists, so that the secular spirit reigned supreme, not only in the chair of the professor, but among the youth which sat on the benches to learn. The royal authority exerted itself more and more, came triumphant out of the civil wars, and set itself down in the chair of Peter so far as it could; and all this with the assent and consent of the learned doctors of all the faculties in the University of Paris. There were many causes, no doubt, that helped to ruin the study of the Canon Law, and our author is of opinion that the most substantial cause was the Gallican tendency, which led the teachers of the Canon Law into courses diametrically opposed to the ecclesiastical jurisprudence, robbing it of its character of *Jus Pontificium* (p. 228).

It might be fairly assumed, considering the nature of the matter, that men whose duty is to teach the law of the Church, that they at least would strenuously resist all temptation to disfigure and pervert the learning of which they are in a great degree the lawful guardians. But, in fact, it is very commonly otherwise. Somehow or other the doctors of the law teach it not, but misuse it, and by many means subvert it, in favour of worldliness and all that belongs to that unhappy temper. This mischief was known in England, for in 1283 Archbishop Peckham was compelled to take severe measures to check it. The ecclesiastical lawyers pleading in the Archbishop's courts in the supposed interests of their clients contrived to obtain from the Court of Chancery writs of prohibition to the ecclesiastical judge, thereby withdrawing the cognisance of an ecclesiastical cause from the proper ecclesiastical court, to the ruin of the liberty of the Church. The evil was never corrected, though it incurred excommunication, and the prohibitions survived the Reformation, and died only when

the Protestant members of Doctors Commons were suppressed. But with the suppression of Doctors Commons the old theory was not suppressed, for it is possible even now with a Protestant religion, a Protestant lawyer, and a Protestant bishop, to obtain, if desirable, the venerable writ of prohibition which in the Middle Ages brought so much evil in its train.

---

*The Century Dictionary: An Encyclopedic Lexicon of the English Language.* Prepared under the superintendence of WILLIAM DWIGHT WHITNEY, Ph.D., LL.D., Professor of Comparative Philology and Sanskrit in Yale University. In Six Volumes. Vol. III. G-L, Vol. IV. M-P. London: T. Fisher Unwin. New York: *The Century Co.*

IN July of last year we noticed the first and second volumes of this magnificent work; and already there are two more volumes before us, and we notice that the energetic publishers are confident of being able to complete the issue this year. This rapid printing and publication of an enormous lexicographical work, which has already run to page 4880 (its pages large quarto size and triple-columned), is really a feat that excites one's admiration, especially when we take into account the accuracy of the text, and the profusion and artistic perfection of the thousands of illustrative woodcuts. In the unstinted praise which we felt justified in extending to the "Century Dictionary" in July, we gave a special word to these delicate and attractive illustrations. When the work is completed there will be about 8000 of them; and they are not merely a gathering of such woodcuts as the printers could command from existing works, they are in the true sense illustrations, many of them, as the abundant pictures of American fauna, specially valuable, and most of them newly and expressly executed for the Dictionary; which thus, as becomes *The Century*, explains an almost incredible number of words (over 200,000), not only by the latest results of philology, but by a series of illustrative extracts from the best modern English literature, and by the best methods of modern pictorial art.

We noted before the general technical excellence of the work here accomplished, under the direction of Dr. Whitney, by himself, his managing editor, seven editorial assistants, thirty-two special contributors, and what not besides. The Dictionary thus takes a high place as a compendious encyclopedia, the terms of Law, Medicine, Botany, Zoology, the Fine Arts, and the Physical Sciences being fully and comprehensively treated. An inspection of the varied information, packed with utmost brevity under such headings—to take only the last issued volume—as Paper, Pearl, Police, Porcelain, Phonograph, Parotid Gland, &c., would show that modern and technical subjects are so fully treated that a reliable general idea of them, sufficient for countless, if not for most intelligent readers, is here to be found along with the more proper work of a first-rate dictionary. Our special

interest in the first volume was with the general accuracy and fairness of the theological, liturgical, and like terms of Catholic or religious interest, and we mentioned that definitions of special Catholic matters had been submitted to a Catholic divine, Mgr. Preston, of New York, of acknowledged competence. The fairness and fulness we then praised in the treatment of such words as Agnus Dei, Baptism, Chrism, Catholic, Cross, &c. &c., may be extended to the treatment of similar words falling within the limits of the third and fourth volumes, Pax, Pilgrim, Pope, and not a few others. It will be understood that we have not examined each page of the 2500 comprised in these two volumes; but from repeated and careful reference to a large variety of words, we have found much to admire, and do not hesitate to write eulogistically about this scholarly and elegant Dictionary.

---

*The Vikings in Western Christendom*, A.D. 789 and A.D. 888. By C. F. KEARY, M.A., F.S.A. London: T. Fisher Unwin. 1891.

MR. Keary tells us that his work was begun nearly ten years ago. Every page gives evidence of patient labour, and one feels that one has to deal with no second-hand compilation, but the work of a man who has gone to the original sources for both information and inspiration. The contrast with Mr. du Chaillu's sketchy work published some three or four years ago, under a similar name, is very striking. Mr. du Chaillu gave us a wrong-headed essay. Mr. Keary's book is a solid contribution to the history of a most difficult period. He gives facts as well as views. We may disagree with him at times, but even when we do so we feel that he is a helpful guide through the labyrinth of confused records which make up the materials of Viking history.

The period he has selected for treatment is that in which the Scandinavian peoples "were growing, but had not yet fully grown, into nationalities." With most other peoples this is a time when legend and history are so mingled together that it is impossible to wholly disentangle them, but the historian of the Viking age has the advantage of being able to use the contemporary chronicles of Christian Europe as a guide to his researches. It is true that, as Mr. Keary points out, historians often extend the term "Viking Age" to include the later period, when the Northmen had grouped themselves into nations, but he suggests that it would be well to limit it, as he has done, to the earlier time when the world knew the Northman only as the Viking raider from beyond the North Sea.

I think it would be an advantage [he says] if the use of the term could be confined to just this epoch in the life of the Northern people and to no other; to their age of Storm and Stress, the age of their formation. It would be an advantage, too, if it were more generally borne in mind that the history of the North begins *now* and at no earlier time. The Vikings of this period are for us the whole Scandinavian people; we know no other—if, at any rate, we except a notice here and there of the kings of Southern Denmark. But the pre-eminence of the antiquaries of the North, overshadowing the study of

Scandinavian history, has rather tended to obscure the fact. All histories (almost) of Scandinavian lands begin with prehistoric antiquities, which are not history. Or it may be that the historians of these countries have not liked to realise how far down in time their history begins; so that prehistoric discoveries or unauthenticated traditions preserved in the sagas of a later age have been brought in to fill up what is for history, in the proper sense of the word, a mere blank.

The history of the Vikings shows us, therefore, nation-making in actual progress. But it has a further interest as a picture of the struggle between Christianity and heathendom in Northern Europe. The wild sea warriors who at one moment seemed to be on the point of setting up Paganism again in the Christian lands of North-western Europe, were destined to found nations which a few centuries later became the tried champions of the Cross against new dangers from the East and South. Mr. Keary's work stops short of the time when the Norseman became the Norman, but it is to be hoped that he will be able to carry on his story to this later stage. The work he has so far done is eminently helpful to the students of history. Some day we hope to see the same story told by a Catholic historian. What defects there are in Mr. Keary's work arise from his looking at Catholicity from the outside. He has not the key which would enable him to understand much that he finds puzzling in the history of the early Middle Ages. It is true that he distinguishes between popular superstitions and what he calls the "official belief" of the Church, but he does not always know where to place the boundary, and his theory of the sacramental system as a kind of "Christian magic" shows how his standpoint has distorted his view. But it is not for his theories as to the Christianity of the eighth and ninth centuries that his book is valuable, but for his clear marshalling of the historic facts as to the way in which the storm of the Viking invasions broke over Northern and Western Europe. Here he has made much that was hitherto obscure not only intelligible, but vividly real, and the close connection of the story with that of our own islands gives it a special interest, when we are shown the so-called Danish invasions from the point of view of the invaders, and in their relation to the general movement of the Viking conquests.

---

*Henri VIII. et les Martyrs de la Chartreuse de Londres.* Avec cartes, plans, heliogravures, fac-simile, &c. Par Dom VICTOR MARIE DOREAU, Prieur de la Chartreuse de Saint Hugues, Parkminster, Sussex. Paris: Retaux-Bray. 1890.

"A HISTORY of the Carthusians in England" would have been a more fitting title to this noble volume than the too modest one chosen by the Prior of the Parkminster Charterhouse. True it is that the thrilling account of the struggle between Henry VIII. and the London Carthusians forms the centre of interest in the volume, but a historical sketch of the Order in England introduces the narrative, and we are subsequently made to follow the fortunes of the exiled



monks down to the death of Prior Williams in 1797. There is an indescribable charm about the white-robed children of St. Bruno lending its fragrance to every page. Dom Doreau has added to the value and attractiveness of his work by never for a moment disguising instances of human frailty in the annals of his Order, and we remain after reading it from first line to last with the conviction that the author justly claims for it "*le mérite d'une parfaite authenticité.*" With quiet irony he warns the curious in general to give no credence to the imaginative writers who assure you that each Carthusian digs his own grave in the cloister, and salutes his brethren when he meets them with a "*memento mori.*"

Of real interest is the enumeration of the several Carthusian monasteries which formerly existed in these islands. Witham in Somerset was the earliest foundation, made by Henry II., and governed by St. Hugh of Avalon, afterwards Bishop of Lincoln. It dates from 1174. It was followed by that of Hinton, in the same county, in 1227. For a brief period a Carthusian house existed in Ireland, we know not where, and was dissolved in 1321. Hull (1378) and Coventry (1381) follow next. William de la Zouche in 1383 established the Carthusians in the Cluniac priory of Totnes, which, however, was re-occupied by Benedictines three years later. The foundation of Axholme, in Lincolnshire (1397), which owes its origin to Thomas Mowbray, Duke of Norfolk, had for its title the Visitation of Our Blessed Lady. Mount Grace, near York (1397), Sheen (1414), a royal foundation, and Perth, founded by James I. of Scotland, have had their renown eclipsed by that of the London Charterhouse (1370), on which the history described in this volume mainly turns. From this list it will be seen that Parkminster is the twelfth Carthusian house, all told, that has existed in the British Isles.

Quite as much interest attaches to the history given to the world for the first time of the vicissitudes of the English Carthusians from the epoch of the Reformation to that of the Revolution. Maurice Chauncey returned to England under Queen Mary, and re-established his community at Sheen. At the accession of Elizabeth the English Carthusians retired to Bruges, their house there bearing the name of Sheen Anglorum. Compelled to take flight by the Calvinist armies, they next found shelter at Louvain. In 1581 Chauncey died, and was succeeded in his office of Prior by Roger Thompson. His successors at Louvain were Francis Barnard, John Arnold, and Walter Pitts, under whose government the community removed to Malines. Pitts was succeeded by Robert Darbyshire, who as a secular priest had been imprisoned for the Faith at Newgate. Robert Mallory and Thomas Hallows followed, and under Prior Hallows the English community made its last move, to Nieuport. John Duckett, John Hutton, George Transam, Peter Bitcliffe governed their monastery in peace and prosperity (1644-1693). In 1693 half the community were carried off by pestilence; the rest, dreading the thoughts of being governed by a foreigner, elected Dom Thomas Thorold, a young monk, whose election was confirmed by the General Chapter. But the General of the

Order, Dom Le Marson, who governed with energy and prudence from 1675 to 1703, closed the novitiate of Nieuport in consequence of the election, and deposed Dom Thorold. A Flemish monk, Van Herenbeck, governed Sheen Anglorum for a year, after which the community elected William Hall, formerly a secular priest and Court preacher to James II. Jerome Nyversele, a Fleming, succeeded Hall, then George Hunter, after whom Dom Hall again held office for three years. Doms Columban Tounley, Joseph Betts, who entered the cloister after the death of his wife, and had the happiness to see all his children religious; Charles Lee, Thomas Yates, James Long, the author of "*Notitia Cartusianorum Anglorum*," called by Dom Doreau "*L'histoire complète des chartreux anglais sur le continent*"; Dom Bruno Fleming, who died in 1761, continue the list. After Fleming's death a gap intervenes of three years, the name of the Prior from 1761 to 1764 being unknown. In the latter year William Mann was elected Prior, and in 1777 was succeeded by the last Prior of Sheen Anglorum, Dom Joseph Williams. Joseph Williams was born on September 5, 1729, being the thirteenth child of Thomas Williams and Elizabeth Monington. He made his profession on the 13th of October 1759. His monastery was suppressed by the royal Jansenist, Joseph II., in 1783, and on the last day of June in that year he left it for the convent of the English Augustinian Canonesses at Bruges. In 1789 we find him at Louvain with the community now settled at Abbotsleigh, in the diocese of Plymouth. The advance of the French armies compelled the nuns to fly to England. He started in their company, and for the rest of his days lived with his relations at Little Malvern Court, in the faithful observance of his rule. Dom Doreau consecrates a dozen pages to his biography, and gives his portrait, one of many excellent illustrations that adorn his noble work. The papers and other relics of the English community left by Prior Williams to his family have, by Mr. Berington's spontaneous kindness, been restored to the Carthusians of Parkminster. Dom Williams died in 1747, the last survivor, as far as we know, of the Carthusians of Sheen Anglorum.

---

*Lessons from the Lives of Three Great Fathers; with Appendices.*

By WILLIAM BRIGHT, D.D., Canon of Christ Church, Oxford,  
Regius Professor of Ecclesiastical History. London: Longmans. 1890.

THIS volume is based on a series of lectures delivered in the Cathedral at Oxford, on the lives of SS. Athanasius, John Chrysostom, and Augustine. The addresses themselves have been enlarged, an introduction prefixed, and appendices given to illustrate some points in fuller detail. The preface is designed to lessen the force of Cardinal Newman's repeated statement, that "the study of the Fathers" brought him into the Catholic Church. Dr. Bright's main point is that the Cardinal's study of the Fathers was "insensibly affected by a Romeward bias." As the author assumes this to be

erroneous, we are confronted by an argument in a circle, whither it would not be profitable to follow him. We may content ourselves with pointing out that Dr. Bright has omitted to notice the Cardinal's own account of the Protestant prejudices which at first made his patristic reading barren. For the rest, we can appeal to a cloud of witnesses, who, since the "Essay on Development" was written, have arisen to testify to the truth of his statement. Renan in France, and the historical school of rationalists in Germany, have abundantly proved that "to read the Fathers, and to get further than the paper on which they are written, is to be either a Catholic or an infidel," though they have unhappily chosen the latter alternative.

Of the lives themselves, that of St. Athanasius seems to us most pleasing, that of St. John Chrysostom least so. The former in particular may be read with great interest for its vivid portrayal of the great moral qualities of the defender of the orthodox faith, though, of course, we miss the description of the interior and supernatural life which lay behind and above them. Catholic readers would probably complain most of the inadequate and confused, though learned, account given of the thorny subject of grace. Dr. Bright does not seem to have grasped the essential difference between Calvinism and Jansenism; and, with some reserves, follows Mozley in thinking St. Augustine was a predestinarian. On the other hand, we are indebted to him for a frank acknowledgment that the Church was right in condemning Jansenism; and some of the other appendices on St. Augustine cannot fail to give Anglicans a clearer idea of points of Catholic doctrine.

---

*St. Thomas d'Aquin et la Philosophie Cartésienne: Etudes de Doctrines Comparées.* Par le R. P. E.-V. MAUMUS, des Frères Prêcheurs. Two vols. Paris: Lecoffre. 1890.

THIS work, as its title implies, is in the main a comparison of the philosophy of St. Thomas with that of Descartes. The author goes, however, farther, and fortunately discusses many other questions. Thus, in the first volume we have a very full defence of syllogistic reasoning, and an account of the nature of life. In the second volume, too, the various sceptical systems (which the author does well to connect with Descartes) are criticised, under the head of Certainty; while under that of Ideas, we have a full refutation of Ontologism and Hegelianism. We think it is to be regretted that a good deal of space should be devoted to a defence, however brilliant and interesting, of "physical premotion," and its compatibility with free-will.

In a work of this kind no one would expect great originality, which would, indeed, not be a merit. It is, therefore, such praise as the author would most desire, when we say that the reader will here find the teaching of St. Thomas expounded in lucid and attractive French. We may remark, as a special feature of the work, the numerous

quotations from the Saint's Commentaries on Aristotle, which, being little read, will often be new to those who are familiar with his other works.

We shall look forward with interest to a work Father Maumus announces as nearly ready, on "Contemporary Philosophers"—Vacherot, Taine, Janet, and Caro. For—shall we say it?—human thought has moved so much beyond Descartes, and the pendulum has swung so far in the opposite direction, that a minute examination of Cartesianism has an air of unreality to our eyes.

---

*Natural Theology and Modern Thought.* The Donellan Lectures delivered before the University of Dublin in 1888–1889. By J. H. KENNEDY, B.D. London: Hodder & Stoughton. 1891.

THESE lectures appear to us to reach a higher level than the average. The objections raised by Kant and by Darwinians against the proofs of the existence of God are each dealt with in a manner that is rare in any single work. We may single out, as specially worthy of attention, the very full account, in the second lecture, of Du Bois Reymond's "Seven Riddles of the Universe." The fourth lecture is still more important, and—as far as we know—original. In it Dr. Kennedy shows that the beauty and sublimity of nature are inexplicable on the theory of natural selection alone, and need the further assumption of design. He points out that Darwin's explanation of the beauty of organic forms introduces a new element; it is not the survival of the fittest, but of the fittest to please, and so postulates consciousness and will; moreover, the Darwinian theory does not account for the beauty and sublimity of inorganic nature. So, too, Dr. Kennedy meets, as we think successfully, Kant's objections to his thesis, which, if less widely known than Darwin's, are more serious; the most formidable being that beauty and sublimity have no objective value, but are derived from our own emotions of pleasure and pain. The lecturer shows by analysis that sublimity is not mere size, nor beauty power, but that both connote order and harmony, and consequently point to a designer. Finally, in the last lecture, Kant's use of the moral argument is dealt with in a very powerful and searching manner. The volume may be confidently recommended to all students of the subjects with which it deals.

---

*Les Mémoires de Saint-Simon et le Père Le Tellier, Confesseur de Louis XIV.* Par le Père P. BLIARD, S.J. Paris: Plon, Nourrit et Cie. 1891.

ON the death of Père Lachaise in 1709, Père le Tellier was chosen to succeed him in the onerous office of Confessor to the King, that king being Louis XIV. Saint-Simon, in his memoirs, gives a very repulsive picture of the new confessor's character and conduct. Père

Bliard tells us in his preface that when first he read these memoirs he felt that the picture of Le Tellier was so utterly unlike that of a priest that he doubted its historic accuracy, as well as that of the accompanying portrait of Cardinal Dubois, and he resolved, when he had the leisure, to test Saint-Simon's story by investigating the contemporary records of the period. In this volume we have the first-fruits of these studies. In its pages we find, not indeed a panegyric of Le Tellier, but a thorough vindication of his career, which shows that Saint-Simon's portrait was something more than a caricature. Incidentally Père Bliard's learned researches throw much light upon the inner history of a time which is often completely misunderstood, because the purely literary interest of some gossiping writer of memoirs makes ninety-nine in every hundred readers accept them as a substitute for the drier records of impartial history.

---

*Alexander Heriot Mackonochie: A Memoir.* By E. A. T. Edited by EDWARD FRANCIS RUSSELL, M.A., St. Alban's, Holborn. London: Kegan Paul, Trench & Co.

THIS memoir of the late Mr. Mackonochie presents a picture of a singularly amiable life brought prematurely to a pathetically tragic close. In every chapter one reads words that make one long that he had come a step further and entered into the full possession of Catholic truth. One can feel no reasonable doubt as to his perfect good faith. Involved as he was year after year in the battle for what is popularly known as the Ritualistic position in the Church of England, he seems never to have looked seriously at the further question of the position held by that Church itself in Christendom. One wonders how this should have been so, but it undoubtedly was the case; and he never himself grasped the fuller significance of facts whose bearing on the question of Ritual was clear enough to him. Thus, writing to Liddon, he notes as one of the ground facts of the situation

that most of the bishops brought up in an opposite school of thought are utterly incapable of forming the slightest conception of what ceremonial is to us; that they cannot imagine the ceremonies of the Mass being anything but child's play, when to us they are the barest alphabet of reverence for so Divine a mystery.

Imagine a Catholic priest in any country or in any age of the Church writing thus of the bishops of his province! Yet Mackonochie seems never to have doubted that such a state of things could fit in with the working theory of the Anglican being a real portion of the Church Catholic.

But so far as he saw the truth he was fearlessly faithful to it, and of the good practical work he did the pages of this memoir give ample evidence. Not the least interesting is the letter from the Catholic Primate of all Ireland to one of the clergy of St. Alban's, expressing his sympathy with them in their loss, and adding: "I cannot forget how

nobly you and your brethren at St. Alban's, including the lamented deceased, came to my aid when my poor starving people in Donegal stood in such need of sympathy and assistance." The Archbishop of Armagh was not, we are sure, the only Catholic who heard with sorrow of the death of Mr. Mackonochie among the snows of a Highland pass. There is a view of the spot, and a good portrait.

---

*Registration of Title v. Registration on Assurances.* By H. BROUGHAM LEECH, LL.D. London: William Ridgway. Dublin: Hodges, Figgis & Co. 1891.

THIS book, which has been written at the request of the Executive Committee of the Irish Landowners' Convention, advocates the establishment of a Registry of Title in Ireland, in lieu of the existing system of a Registry of Deeds. As to the theoretical superiority of the former system there are no conflicting opinions. The difficulty lies in its practical adaptation to the requirements of a country where complicated limitations of land are permitted; where there exists a dual title, legal and equitable; and where the boundaries of land are irregular and very often unascertained. Mr. Leech quotes in an Appendix, in support of his conclusions, the opinions of seven Lords Chancellors, Mr. Parnell, and Gulliver's Travels.

---

*Black is White; or, Continuity Continued.* By the Author of "The Prigment," "Dulce Domum," "A Romance of the Recusants," &c. London: Kegan Paul, Trench, Trübner & Co. 1890.

THE satirical humour of this recent production from "The Prig's" facile pen will be welcomed by a large circle of appreciative readers. There are in England both Catholics and Protestants who look with like contempt on the vagaries and views of the discordant doctors of Anglicanism, and who have never cared to follow the miserable meanderings of the apologists and defenders of "the absurd and impossible position." But to all who, with amused and pitying eye, have watched the wanderings of Anglican theory from "comprehensiveness" to "continuity," "Black is White" will prove highly entertaining. In it the author of "The Prigment" looks into futurity, and we have a popular Prime Minister, at a loss for a popular cry, bringing in a Bill for the "Re-establishment of the Established Church," with the Postmaster-General as its head upon earth. And here is how this legislation was brought about:

The professors of the religion of Robert Elsmere, commonly called Elsmereans, had become a sect, immense both in numbers and in power; a mild form of Buddhism was on the increase, and Evangelical reaction was setting in in the very heart of the Established Church. Ritualism was going out of fashion, and where it existed it was in general diluted with faddism of some



kind; one Ritualistic clergyman mixed it with spiritualism, another with hypnotism, a third with Wesleyanism, a fourth with Socialism, a fifth with Pantheism, and so on. In short, while those outside the pale of the Established Church were trying to knock it down, these inside appeared to be trying to pull it to pieces. In determining to respond to the "Cry of the People," the famous legislator was very far from wishing to incur the odium of disestablishing his own Church; moreover, it would have been a clumsy blunder on the part of so brilliant a statesman to answer to any demand directly. Rather than walk straight to meet people half-way, he greatly preferred to travel double the distance slantwise. "Are you contemplating concurrent endowment?" asked a member of his Government to whom he had partially communicated his designs. "No; that is too hackneyed. Comprehension is to be the keynote of my scheme. I will bring the Methodists, the Baptists, the Elsmerians, the Salvationists, the Unitarians, and possibly even the Esoteric Buddhists, within the pale of a powerful, benevolent, and highly elastic Church." "But what about the Christadelphians, the Glassites, the Alethians, and the host of other sects named in the page of small print in 'Whitaker's Almanack,' headed 'Religious Denominations and Sects'?" Do you propose to comprehend them also, or what is to become of them?" "Oh, they may all go to the devil," said the pious Prime Minister.

Readers of "The Prig" will see at a glance how pleasantly parodied are the relations between Anglicans and other Dissenters, and the relations of all of them with the Catholic Church. The best bits in the book, however, are too lengthy to quote; even if plentiful quotation were quite fair to a book of this character. Not only is this little volume full of fun, a rich flow of humour rippling through every page, but, seeing how ridicule can at times kill, perusal of these pages may convince some that the "solution of continuity" has been reached. We trust that, besides amusing, "Black is White" may prove to many a source of instruction as well.

---

*Devia Cypria: Notes of an Archæological Journey in Cyprus in 1888.*  
By D. G. HOGARTH, M.A. London: H. Frowde. 1889.

MR. HOGARTH was a Craven Travelling Fellow of the University of Oxford in 1887, and was commissioned to conduct researches in Cyprus by excavation and travel. The results of the latter are given in this handsome volume, and extend over those parts of the island which have been less explored—viz., the Papho district and the Carpass. Nothing of first-rate importance seems to have come under his notice; but numerous fragmentary remains—chiefly inscriptions—of the civilisations which have succeeded one another in Cyprus, from the early Asiatic to the Venetian occupation in the Middle Ages. These remains are described in a scholarly, yet agreeable, manner; the result being a volume of much more interest than such records of travel usually are.

---

1. *Cantiones Bohemicæ*. Leiche Lieder und Rufe des 13, 14, und 15 Jahrhunderts nach Handschriften.
  2. *Hymnarius Moissiacensis*. Das Hymnar der Abtei Moissac im 10 Jahrhundert.
  3. *Conradus Gemnicensis*. Konrads von Haimburg, Alberts von Prag und Ulrichs von Wessobrunn Reimgebete.
  4. *Udalricus Wessofontanus*. Ulrich Stöcklins Abts von Wessobrunn 1438–1443. Reimgebete und Leselieder.
  5. *Historiæ Rhythmicæ*. Liturgische Reimofficien des Mittelalters aus Handschriften und Wiegendrucken.
  6. *Hymni inediti*. Liturgische Hymnen des Mittelalters aus handschriftlichen Breviarien, Antiphonarien und Processionalien.
  7. *Prosarium Lemovicense*. Die Prosen der Abteien St. Martial in Limoges aus Troparien des 10, 11, und 12 Jahrhunderts.
  8. *Sequentiæ Ineditæ*. Liturgische Prosen des Mittelalters aus Handschriften und Wiegendrucken.
- Two vols. All the above by G. M. DREVES, S.J. Leipzig: Beisland. 1886–90.

IT is a great pleasure to me to bring before the reader this collection of hymns, responsaries, religious "folk-songs," &c. Father Dreves's collection may be pronounced unsurpassed by anything in its line, both for its size and for the critical ability of its editor. This praise is given it without at all forgetting the important collections of Mone and Daniel. Mone collected some 1200, Daniel 1500 hymns. Father Dreves's above-cited nine volumes contain 2194 Latin pieces of the Middle Ages. A few of them had indeed already appeared in, now rare, "incunabulæ," but the vast majority are now first edited, and these nine volumes are to be followed by a tenth, now in the press, and that by nine others in due course. Father Dreves's work has already won for itself admiring recognition among German scholars, both Catholic and Protestant. A learned Protestant divine has remarked (in the *Blätter für Hymnologie*, 1888) *à propos* of it, on the immense treasures of sacred literature which were lost to knowledge with the invention of printing. The active minds of the Renaissance monopolised the new art for their own aims, and threw aside the religious songs of the Middle Ages. A superficial examination of Father Dreves's volumes is enough to show one how true this remark is. He displays treasures, the mere existence of which was unsuspected, the value of which it would be difficult to exaggerate—they throw light on mediæval theology, hymnography, on the liturgy and the popular share in it, and on the general character of the education and the poetry of the "dark ages."

The editor has done his work most ably. He gives a critical text, with the comparison of various MSS. in foot-notes, and each volume opens with a critical introduction on the authorship of the poems, their relation to the period, significance and poetical value. Now that Mone and Daniel are both scarce and expensive, we may hope that libraries will enrich themselves with this ampler and newer collection—an immense storehouse of mediæval poetry, gathered together with marvellous industry and edited with conspicuous ability.

BELLESHEIM.

*Prælectiones Juris Canonici.* Quas habet M. BARGILLIAT in Seminario Corisopitensi. Tomus I. Parisiis: Brèche & Tralin. 1890.

THIS manual of Canon Law seems admirably adapted for both class use and for private reference; it is written with wonderful clearness and directness of statement, and the orderly arrangement of matter adds considerably to the ease with which it can be consulted. Then also the author, mindful of Pius IX.'s wish that young ecclesiastics should study the teachings of Canon Law "taken from authors approved by the Holy See," draws his statements largely from the most approved teachers, not confining himself, however, to them, but embracing newly brought in laws and recent decrees. We shall be perhaps better able to say more of the qualities of the work when we receive vol. ii., which is not yet published. The present volume covers half the ground planned out for himself by the author; he divides it into ten treatises, and five are dealt with in this volume—viz. (1) Principles of Canon Law, (2) Jurisdiction, (3) The Pope and the Roman Curia, (4) Bishops and Synods, (5) Episcopal counsellors and helpers, and administration of dioceses *sede vacante*; there remain to be treated: (6) Parish priests and assistants, (7) Regulars, (8) Church goods, (9) Judgments, and (10) Pains and penalties. We confidently recommend this lucid guide-book, which bears the imprimatur of the Bishop of Quimper, in whose seminary the author professes Canon Law.

*Histoire de la Philosophie.* Par son Eminence le CARDINAL Z. GONZALES, des Frères Prêcheurs, &c. Traduite de l'Espagnol, &c., par le R. P. G. DE PASCAL. Four vols. Paris: P. Lethielleux. London: Burns & Oates.

THE great Dominican, the Cardinal Archbishop of Seville, has written a history of philosophy which may be called without exaggeration a monumental work, and one which deserves to be translated into every modern language. The author is wonderfully widely read in the history and literature of philosophy, ancient and modern; his knowledge of St. Thomas and of scholasticism generally, as one would expect from a Dominican professor, is profound, yet he is very far from being a bigot. A high philosophical authority, M. Domet de Vorges, in a remarkable *rapport* presented to the "Congrès bibliographique international" in 1888, in which he estimates this History of Philosophy very highly, says, *à propos* of Cardinal Gonzales' scholastic bias: "Son amour pour cette grande Philosophie [scholastique] ne l'aveugle pas; jamais il ne dégénère en une admiration servile. Pour lui la Philosophie de Saint Thomas est tout simplement le plus haut point où l'esprit humain soit parvenu, en égard aux ressources dont disposait le moyen-âge." This moderation may be recognised in countless places; his criticism, for example, of San Severino is: "Son critérium est exagérément scholastique, pour ainsi dire, et n'offre pas

le sens large qui serait à désirer en certaines matières." He himself certainly possesses this *sens large*, and deals with modern philosophers and modern systems, for example, to an extent, and with an attention and frank appreciation, which is eminently satisfactory. Of course he also criticises keenly from his own standpoint of a Christian philosopher and a Thomist; but this is just the valuable element in his work for us; and his appreciations are philosophical, and not merely class prejudices. Mr. Wilfrid Ward, in an article in our present number, is anxious that the claims of modern thought should not be considered as having been put beyond a Catholic's appreciation by the Pope's restoration of St. Thomas to the leadership of the Catholic schools; here is a Spanish Dominican Cardinal who gives two of the four volumes of his history to an analytical examination of the chief modern philosophers of every nation, whose interest in "le génie de Kant" leads him to give fifty pages to that philosopher alone, not more than sixty having been given to St. Thomas himself. Indeed, for those whom ability or duty may justify in attempting the arduous task of investigating modern philosophy for the purpose of measuring its value, adjusting its position, and ranging its sounder conclusions under the principles of Thomism, we should say that Cardinal Gonzales' History would prove, in their task, a veritable guide and friend. For the moment, limit of space and time must restrict us to this brief recommendation of Cardinal Gonzales' History. Père G. de Pascal has done a great service by rendering it into a language more universally known than its original Spanish; he has also, more particularly in the modern half, added to it some valuable notes.

---

*Meditations on the Gospels for Every Day in the Year.* By PÈRE MÉDAILLE, S.J. Translated under the direction of the Rev. W. H. EYRE, S.J. London: Burns & Oates. 1891.

THE meditations of Père Médaille are excellently translated, and the volume is one we would cordially recommend. Meditation books abound, and tastes differ: we need only say that this one appeals to our predilections by its brevity—each meditation, of three points, extends little, if at all, beyond a page—they are full of what Father Eyre happily calls "germs of thought," which any ordinary mind may develop for itself (and should, to make meditation profitable), and last, but not least, they deal with those Gospels which the Church has selected for Sunday, and which contain substantial mental and spiritual food for the rest of the week, if only intelligently thought over. Here is a good help to doing this. There is a sufficient instruction prefixed on the method of meditating, and some valuable practical suggestions. Father Eyre has some excellent prefatory words; from which we take only, that although Père Médaille was a Frenchman, he "writes soberly and singularly free from far-fetched sentiment"—a commendatory estimate of him, which the book itself, as we think,

confirms. He was a zealous, hard-working priest of the Society, who died at an advanced age in 1709; and these meditations, now first published in English, have already been translated into Latin, Italian, Spanish, German, and Dutch, and have, in one language or another, seen nearly forty editions. We have only one little criticism to offer: this is a book which we should be glad to know becomes largely used by laymen; what could be better for their spiritual life in the midst of the world than this solid study of the Gospel truths in Gospel words? Why, therefore, when translating the French, have not the little texts from the Gospel been translated from the Latin? They are, of course, sometimes given in English in the course of the previous or subsequent sentence, but, so far as we can see, had better have been formally given in that Douay translation which is heard on Sundays from the altar or pulpit. As they stand they will, we venture to think, only perplex the reader, who will wonder whether some precious thought of Scripture or a Father is not being hidden from him in the mysterious Latin. That is the only fault we can find in an admirable edition, well printed, and carefully edited.

---

PUBLICATIONS OF THE CATHOLIC TRUTH SOCIETY.

1. *Lectures on the Present Position of Catholics in England* (1851). By J. H. NEWMAN, D.D. Lectures viii. and ix., 2d. each.  
"Biographical Series," 1d. each:
2. *St. Vincent de Paul*. By Rev. J. GOLDIE, S.J.
3. *Ven. Oliver Plunket* (1629-1681).
4. *Blessed Juvenal Ancina*. By the Rev. J. MORRIS, S.J.
5. *The Venerable Curé of Ars*. By Lady HERBERT.
6. *A Christmas Story-Book*, 1d.
7. *Helen Forsyth*. By H. M. LUSHINGTON.
8. *A Book of Irish Poetry*, 1d.
9. *Our National Vice*. By His Eminence the CARDINAL ARCHBISHOP OF WESTMINSTER. 1d.
10. *The Temperance Movement*. By Very Rev. Canon MURNANE, V.G., and *Thrift*, by Rev. EDMOND NOLAN. 1d.
11. *Eight Catholic Temperance Leaflets*, 1d., or 6d. per 100.
12. *England's Conversion by the Power of Prayer*. By the BISHOP OF SALFORD. 1d.
13. *The Fourfold Difficulty of Anglicanism; or, The Church of England tested by the Nicene Creed*. By Very Rev. J. SPENCER NORTHCOTE, D.D. Second Edition. 6d.  
London: Catholic Truth Society, 18, West Square, S.E.

THE style, general good quality, and the cheapness of the C.T.S.'s publications are now sufficiently well known, and the titles of the above so far explain themselves that we may dispense ourselves from any detailed reference to their contents. The last named on the list is a republication—with slight emendations—of a valuable series

of letters first published by Provost Northcote six months after his conversion: "partly in justification of the step I had taken, but chiefly with the hope of inducing others to follow my example." That they have already done good in the latter direction, we believe; that in their republished form they will do further good, we feel confident, and wish them heartily the success the ability and earnestness of their writer merit for them. Of course the fourfold difficulty is the want of that Unity, Holiness, Catholicity and Apostolicity in which those who say the Nicene Creed profess their belief. We need not enter into the subject here cogently argued; but some little personal details given in an introductory letter from the author are interesting, and deserve to be referred to. He tells us how, whilst yet an Anglican clergyman (though already an inquirer, started on the path by Dr. Newman's recent conversion), he had written a letter (among others) to his bishop (the Bishop of Exeter), in which he "specified the supremacy of St. Peter as a subject of which he found quite as much proof in Holy Scripture as of the necessity of Infant Baptism or the Divine Institution of Episcopacy." To which letter he received the following charmingly Anglo-episcopal reply:

BISHOPSTOWE, January 4, 1846.

1. The Church of England does not teach that it is "to be required of any man that either the fitness or blessedness of Infant Baptism or the Divine Institution of Episcopacy should be believed as an article of the faith, or be thought requisite or necessary to salvation."

2. Both these articles are capable of being proved by Scripture. Therefore your *argumentum ad hominem* does not apply. Farewell; I wish I might still subscribe myself your brother, as I still feel towards you,

Your faithful friend,

H. EXETER.

No wonder Provost Northcote adds "this letter was a revelation to me." We warmly recommend this able little book, which deals lucidly, and without controversial acrimony, with a subject of much difficulty to inquiring Anglicans.

*Index to Schürer's History of the Jewish People in the Time of Christ.*

Translated by the Rev. JOHN MACPHERSON, M.A. Edinburgh:

T. & T. Clark. 1891.

WE have already more than once during the course of its publication, expressed our high opinion of Messrs. Clark's English edition of Schürer's great work. We need do no more now than announce the appearance of this Index—or rather series of Indices—which completes the work. The volume also contains some additions and corrections which Professor Schürer wished to be made to Division II. of the work, which was brought out first in the English translation: his additions to Division I. appeared in the volume itself.



*Naturphilosophie im Geiste des hl. Thomas von Aquin.* Von Dr. MATTHIAS SCHNEID. Dritte Auflage. Paderborn: Schoeningh. 1890. [Cosmology according to St. Thomas.]

THE publisher of this volume is bringing out a series of manuals of Catholic theology and philosophy. The philosophical section could scarcely have been started by a more competent scholar than Dr. Schneid, Professor of Philosophy and President of the Episcopal Lyceum in Eichstätt, Bavaria, favourably known by his solid exposition of the teaching of Duns Scotus on "matter" and "form," duly noticed in our pages in 1880. Dr. Schneid is one of those scholars who have set themselves to work out the movement desiderated in the Pontifical letter "*Æterni Patris*." The department in which he has most successfully laboured is the scholastic doctrine on Matter and Form. As early as 1873 he brought out his book on "*Matter and Form in Harmony with the Facts of Natural Science*," which now makes its appearance in a very enlarged form, and is a complete system of cosmology after the mind of St. Thomas. The critical power and wide learning which he brings to bear on the nature of the world and of bodies, &c., is remarkable. The noteworthy feature of the work is that it shows the harmony between St. Thomas's philosophy and the teachings of modern science. He also points out the unstable foundation on which many modern systems of philosophy that boasted to be final and absolute were built, so that they soon grew into discredit, and then disappeared, contrasting them with St. Thomas's philosophy, which has weathered the most formidable storms.

BELLESHEIM.

*Commentary on the Prophecies of Isaiah.* By Dr. FRANZ DELITZSCH. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark.

BY this translation of the fourth edition of Delitzsch's "*Commentary on Isaiah*," the translator and publishers give publicity to a work which will be heartily welcome to all interested in Biblical studies. Dr. Driver's introductory notice is also a mark of well-deserved honour to the memory of the late Leipzig professor. The material presentment of this English edition—superior to that of the original, we have no doubt—is excellent, as all of Messrs. T. & T. Clark's series are: neatly bound, paper good, printing excellent.

On the importance of the subject we hardly need to touch. Isaiah was gifted, above his fellow-prophets, with the prophetic *χάρισμα*, whilst in sympathy for his people and in the earnestness of his conviction as to his divine mission he was not inferior to Jeremias, and far surpassed him in elegance of language and elevation of thought. This is all a trite theme. We take the opportunity, therefore, of this new edition to draw attention to a point to which due notice has not always been given. In the writings of Isaiah we possess, besides all that has gained for them universal love and admiration, one of the greatest proofs for the divine origin of Israel's religion. The pure mono-

theistic conceptions, free from error, and cast into a form both clear and sublime, which are found throughout the two parts of the book, and which were penned at a time when the light of Greek civilisation had only commenced to dawn and the foundations of Rome were scarcely laid, cannot be accounted for in an obvious and satisfactory way unless we have recourse to a supernatural revelation. The various efforts of authors, such as Kuenen, to mark out the path of a *natural* progress along which the prophets of the eighth century, among whom Isaiah takes his place, derived their notions on the unity of God have failed, and their failure is another proof of the truth we assert. Renan must have felt this when he attributed the monotheism of Israel to a kind of instinct or natural tendency peculiar and common to all Semitic people. If this be so, it will be easily admitted that to study the prophets of the eighth century, and especially Isaiah, is very necessary for a just understanding of Israel's religion and history, and that Dr. Driver, by his translation, has done much to promote and facilitate it. It should also be borne in mind that the first thirty-nine chapters of Isaiah—except, perhaps, a few questioned passages—are by critics generally now admitted to be from his hand. The view which Delitzsch has taken on the question of a single or dual authorship of the book of Isaiah is favourable to the latter opinion. And his view, it may be well to say, is the result of an impartial and conscientious examination of all that has been said on either side, and is proposed with great moderation. Unlike many critics of our time, Delitzsch does not allow himself to be carried away by his opinion to the extent of considering it beyond all doubt, and disregarding all that has or can be said against it.

Many readers will be pleased to find that Delitzsch has not changed his opinion as to the famous passage, vii. 14, "Behold the Virgin is with child, and bears a son, and calls his name Immanuel." He has kept, as in his former editions, the word "Virgin," for, though he rightly considers that the Hebrew *almah* has not the conclusive meaning of "Virgo," yet that such was the mind of Isaiah is manifest from the context, the solemnity of the occasion, and the elevation of tone in which the prophet speaks.

Lastly, there is an excellent introductory notice by Dr. Driver, giving us a short sketch of the works and life of Delitzsch; from which may be learned why Delitzsch enjoyed the universal esteem of Christians and Jews alike. He was an able defender of faith in the supernatural, as such taking his place next to Hengstenberg. His views, it is true, were broader; and with regard to Biblical criticism he took a step from which Hengstenberg shrunk back. Yet in this respect also his works have been productive of good. They show, as Dr. Driver points out, that the results of Biblical criticism, if only they are not abused, are compatible with a firm belief in supernatural revelation, and with orthodox Christian faith—which, we may add, is to be found in the Catholic Church alone. Delitzsch, however, was never one of the pioneers of Biblical criticism; he rather followed in the path they had marked out, not because his critical eye was less keen,

but because his character was of a positive kind, his tendency to build up, not to destroy. Not only the critic, but also the Christian, may find satisfaction in his works. And it is this characteristic which will make them live long after those of many of his contemporaries have passed into oblivion.

---

*Of Joyous Gard.* By AELIAN PRINCE. London: Allen & Co. 1890.

A COMPARISON with Tennyson's "Idylls" is inevitable in a poem which deals with the later history of the Knights of the Round Table, and has its scene in the Joyous Gard, the Northumbrian Keep of Sir Lancelot, identified by the author with the site of Bamborough Castle. The present volume, which seems to be a sequel to a previous one entitled "Palomide," by the same author, contains many poetic descriptive passages, but is wanting in definiteness of plot. It is brought out with all the attractiveness of white and gold binding, and hand-made paper.

---

*The Immortals and other Poems.* By WARWICK BOND. London: T. Fisher Unwin.

THE principal poem in this elegant volume describes a vision in which the great poets of all time are made to express their views on the present aspect of human affairs. The following stanzas may serve as an example of the versification and of the manner in which the idea is worked out:

From where they lay  
Sloped down, in field on field of vaporous white,  
A vista to the earth, whence far away  
Came wandering up the height  
Voices; and by that gulf they might espy  
The world's great pageant pass of pomp and misery.

There might they see,  
Each from his fragrant couch of deathless flowers,  
Man's spirit working out his destiny  
'Mid crash of warring powers;  
And there with sacred joy might note the seed  
Themselves had sown break forth in bright heroic deed.

---

*Hedda Gabler.* By HENRIK IBSEN. Translated from the Norwegian by EDMUND GOSSE. London: Heinemann. 1891.

IT would seem as if in the present phase of public taste no literary work can be too dull or too dreary to command a large audience, provided it be sufficiently subversive of established forms of religion or morality. That there is no success like the success of scandal, is

a truth of which the late Pope evidenced his appreciation in his reply to the lady who asked him to recommend her book, that he would do still better for her by putting it on the Index. There is no other explanation of the momentary craze for Ibsen's dramas in this country than that they represent the views of certain advanced thinkers in their hostility to the permanence of domestic ties. Their teaching may be summed up as a crusade against marriage, as an intolerable wrong to a woman who happens to get tired of her husband in the inevitable friction of the fireside. So ardent are the votaries of these improved ethics that they have gone to the length of hiring a theatre in London for the performance, as a free representation, of a play too repulsive in subject to be licensed as a public spectacle. The mischievous intent of these dramas is, however, counteracted by their inanity, as it may be safely affirmed that no feebler or clumsier attempt has ever been made to develop a moral thesis in scenic action. The idea of the characters, such as it is, fails to make itself understood in the pointless and unsuggestive dialogue, nor is there even an attempt to explain their actions by the ordinary motives of humanity. Hedda Gabler, the heroine of the play before us, appears, as far as her character can be discerned at all, to be a woman whose guiding impulse is cold-blooded curiosity, impelling her to lure a reformed drunkard back to vice, and then arm him with a pistol to destroy himself. Her own suicide is inexplicable, unless we suppose her driven to it by *ennui*, as there is not sufficient passion in her composition to account for it otherwise.

---

*Love's Victory.* By JOHN ARTHUR BLAIKIE. London :  
Percival & Co. 1890.

SOME of these graceful lyrics have, as we learn from the Preface, been published in the *Academy* and other periodicals. The author's command of melody and language may be judged of by the subjoined stanzas, extracted from the first poem, "Sunrise upon Atlas":

Afar there riseth, islanded and golden,  
Amid a billowy maze of seething cloud,  
Like tongues of flame that cleave a smoky shroud,  
A many-peaked cluster sun-enfolden.

So vaporous thin yon peaks, they pale and quiver  
Within the intenser sun's resplendent glow ;  
Piercing the sky, no debt to earth they owe,  
Signs of accepted sacrifice for ever.

Flame after flame, and splendour beyond splendour,  
Beacons of sun-birth they on high are set,  
Diviner far than e'er from minaret,  
The call to prayer, the prayer and praise they render.

---

*The Shadows of the Lake and other Poems.* By F. LEYTON.  
London: Kegan Paul & Co. 1890.

THE English monasteries have been so cleared by modern research of the obloquy cast on them by ignorant prejudice that their champions can afford to pass over with merely casual remark a poem, "The Bells beneath the Sea," whose subject is the submergence of one as a judgment on the crimes of which it was the scene. Catholics may take the graceful lines on Father Damien as a set-off against this aspersion on their institutions, and give the author the credit he deserves as the writer of a thoughtful and gracefully expressed collection of poems.

*A Happy Year.* By the Abbé LASAUSSE. Translated by Mrs. JAMES O'BRIEN. New York, &c.: Benziger Brothers. 1890.

THIS is a book of a type not uncommon, containing sayings of the Saints for every day of the year. Each month is dedicated to a special "virtue," and each day has rather less than a page of quotations and commentary.

*Marriage.* Conferences delivered at Notre Dame, Paris. By the Very Rev. Père MONSABRÉ, O.P. Translated from the French by M. HOPPEL. New York: Benziger Brothers. 1890.

THE eminence of Père Monsabré as a pulpit orator necessarily attracts attention to any subject he adorns with his eloquence. But the scandals of divorce courts, both in Europe and America, and the baleful effects upon society in general, too surely resulting from their publication, add to the intrinsic interest of the learned Dominican's present theme, Marriage.

If, as we are bound to believe, Catholics may be better helped spiritually than other Christians merely baptised, it is chiefly because, directly or indirectly, they may enjoy, if they will, sacramental grace sevenfold. The indifference of many Catholics to marriage as a sacrament, resulting in "mixed" marriages so often full of deplorable consequences, makes it all-important that this truth should be earnestly insisted on. And this is what the famous preacher does, with an emphasis and zeal which should go far to counteract the evils of careless custom and of State legislation which are usually so shamefully and so completely opposed to the teaching of the Church.

The Conferences are six in number—viz., 1. "The Sanctity of Marriage;" 2. "The Conjugal Tie;" 3. "Divorce;" 4. "Legislation on Marriage;" 5. "Profanation of Marriage;" 6. "Celibacy and Virginity."

An Index of the Principal Errors contrary to the Dogmas set forth in this volume, forms an additional and useful chapter; while the

value of the book is enhanced by an unusually full Analytical Table of Contents. The volume deserves a large circulation; it is elegantly bound and well printed.

---

*At Ober-Ammergau in 1890.* By P. J. O'REILLY. London: Catholic Truth Society. 1890.

THIS prettily got-up volume is a reprint of papers published in *The Month*, with additions. The writer gives a detailed description of the Passion Play, its scenery and incidents, with a good deal of the dialogue. There are a number of illustrations, and those of the principal persons are good. Mr. O'Reilly makes a few comments, chiefly at the end. He says, "Nathaniel is as real to you as Caiaphas." It is not clear why Nathaniel should not be real; does Mr. O'Reilly take him for a creation of Father Daisenberger? By the way, our English Testament spells the word "Nathanael." Those who have seen the Play will be glad to have this well-written record, and the large majority who have not been able to witness it will read these pages with interest and edification.

---

*Blind Rosa, and other Tales.* 2s.

*The Grey Lady of Hardcastle.* 2s. 6d.

*The Curse of the Village, and The Happiness of being Rich.* By HENDRICK CONSCIENCE. 3s.

*What Might Have Been.* From the French. By MRS. CASHEL HOEY. 3s.

London: Burns & Oates.

THE best recommendation of a popular tale-book is that it has taken the popular fancy. These four volumes have had such success as to lead the publishers to re-issue them in their Popular Library.

Conscience's tales are established favourites; the others, especially "The Grey Lady of Hardcastle," seem to well deserve their success. The volumes are tastefully bound, suitable for presents. Some of the covers bear a brilliant device, intended as a pun, we believe! The youthful buyer can try to decipher it—we will not divulge.

---

1. *Elementary History of England.* By CYRIL RANSOME, M.A. London: Percival & Co. 1890.

2. *The Catholic Child's History of England.* By E. M. Dublin: Sullivan Brothers. 1890.

THESE two books, written on the same subject, and for readers of the same age, present a remarkable contrast: one is all that it ought to be, and the other is all that it ought not to be. Mr. Ransome's little work is accurate, interesting, and well printed. "The Catholic Child's History" is inaccurate, tedious, and badly got up. It is to be hoped that no Catholic teacher will be induced by the title to buy



it. The writer tells us that "sufficient historical facts have been noted to meet the requirements for the Intermediate Examinations of the Junior Grade." One pities the unhappy candidate who should send up the following "historical facts" taken from two pages of the book :

Battle of Lewis (*sic*), 1264.

Spanish Invasion, 1558.

Battle of Worcester, 1657.

Great Plague of London, 1655.

Great Fire of London, 1656.

Hæbeas (*sic*) Corpus Act, 1679.

Rising in Favour of the State (!) 1715.

This is without counting two mistakes in dates (on these same pages), which are notified in a very incomplete list of errata. Now, for a specimen of style :

"But the most wonderful of all inventions, and the most useful of all discoveries, was the contrivance of the electric telegraph, which sets distance at defiance, and successfully conveys messages with fabulous rapidity, not only to the remotest part of this continent, but even across the ocean to America, where telegraphic messages may be received and answered in a single day" (p. 304).

The Catholic child had far better read Mr. Ransome's history. There he will find Catholic matters fairly treated, and if he remembers what he reads, he will stand an excellent chance of passing his examinations.

T. B. S.

*The Theological Influence of the Blessed Virgin on the Apostolic School.*  
By CHRISTIANUS. London: Frederic Norgate.

THE subject of this little work is an interesting and by no means unimportant one, to wit, the part which Our Blessed Lady's verbal testimony played among the human means used by the inspired writers of the New Testament. The writer, in a spirit of sincere piety and praiseworthy zeal, traces this element in the Gospels of SS. Luke and John. Unhappily, his Protestant training has let him be betrayed into passages like the following :

Mary kept His birth from Him (Our Lord) from a natural desire to shield Him from pain and such mental troubles as she must herself have gone through. . . .

Speaking of St. John's preaching our author writes :

Jesus, even if He had not intuitive knowledge of it before, knew now that He was the Son of God, &c.

Throughout the whole book we are constantly reminded by painfully jarring impressions of those low views of Jesus and Mary that are the atmosphere of Protestant tradition. At the same time we are sensible that nothing was farther removed from the author's intention.

## LIST OF BOOKS RECEIVED.

[Many of them too late for review in the present issue].

"The Oxford Movement. Twelve Years, 1833-1845." By R. W. Church, M.A., D.C.L. London: Macmillan & Co. 1891.

"Mary in the Epistles; or, the Implicit Teaching of the Apostles concerning the Blessed Virgin." By Rev. Thomas Livius, C.S.S.R., M.A. Oxon. London: Burns & Oates.

"La Passion." Essai Historique. Par le R. Père M. J. Ollivier, O.S.D. Paris: P. Lethielleux. 1891.

"Studies in the Arthurian Legend." By John Rhys, M.A. Oxford. Clarendon Press: 1891.

"Declarations and Letters on the Vatican Decrees. 1869-1887." By Ignaz von Döllinger. Authorised Translation. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark. 1891.

"History of the Jews from the Earliest Times to the Present Day." By Professor H. Graetz. Edited and in part translated by Bella Löwy. Two vols. London: David Nutt. 1891.

1. "Theophile Foisset. 1800-1873." Par Henri Boissard.

2. "Memoires du General Tercier. 1770-1816." Publiés avec Notes, &c. Par C. de la Chanonie.

3. "La France pendant la Revolution." Par le Vicomte de Broc. Two vols. These three published by Plon et Cie. Paris: 1891.

"Pre-organic Evolution, and the Biblical Idea of God: an Exposition and a Criticism." By Charles Chapman, M.A., LL.D. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark. 1891.

"Kant's 'Principles of Politics,' including his 'Essay on Perpetual Peace.' A contribution to Political Science." Edited and translated by W. Hastie, B.D. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark. 1891.

"Essays in the History of Religious Thought in the West." By Brooke Foss Westcott, D.D., D.C.L., &c. London: Macmillan & Co. 1891.

"The Visible and Invisible Worlds." By the Rev. J. W. Vahey. Milwaukee, Wis.: Hoffman Brothers. 1890.

"Order in the Physical World, and its First Cause according to Modern Science." From the French. By T. J. Selvin. London: John Hodges. 1891.

"Selected Sermons." By the Rev. Christopher Hughes. Introduction by the Rev. Walter Elliott, C.S.P. New York, &c.: Fr. Pustet & Co. 1891.

"Commentarius in Danielelem, Lamentations et Baruch." Auctore J. Knabenbauer, S.J. Paris: P. Lethielleux.

"The Interior of Jesus and Mary." From the French of Père Groun, S.J., and edited by Rev. S. H. Frisbee, S.J. Two vols. New York: Catholic Publication Society Co.; London: Burns & Oates. 1891.

## Record of Roman Documents.

**BEATIFICATION AND CANONISATION.**—In all cases the Rules of Pope Urban VIII. are to be observed—viz. :

I. The Translators and Revisors of the Processes, drawn up in the vernacular, are to be chosen by the Cardinal *Ponente* of the Cause.

II. The manuscript copy of the Process to be sealed and deposited in the episcopal archives ; one transcript only to be made, to be sealed, sent to Rome, and not opened without the Pope's permission.

III. The process to be written on linen paper, not upon machine-made paper. (*S. R. C.*, April 8, 1890.) *Vid. Tablet*, Dec. 27, 1890.

**BEATIFICATIONS AND CANONISATIONS.**—The following are passing through the different stages of the process :—

Ven. Nunzio Sulpicio, diocese of Penne, Province of Abruzzi. *Vid. Tablet*, Feb. 7, 1891.

Ven. Madeleine de Canossa, Foundress of the Daughters of Charity. (Process of Ordinary declared valid.)

Ven. Philomena of St. Coleman, Religious of the Order of Miras of St. Francis of Paul. (Revision of writings.)

Ven. Mary Margaret Dufrost de Lajemmerais, Foundress of Sisters of Charity at Montreal. (Revision of writings.)

Ven. Anne Madeleine Remusat, Professed Religious of the Visitation Order, Marseilles. (Revision of writings.)

Ven. Jean Martin Moye, of the diocese of S. Dié, priest of the *Missions Etrangères*, and Founder of the Sisters of Providence.

Blessed Juvenal Ancina, Bishop of Saluces, of the Congregation of the Oratory. (Mass and Office approved.)

Blessed Boniface of Valperga, Bishop of Aosta. (Mass and Office approved.) *Vid. Tablet*, Dec. 27, 1890.

Ven. Gaspare Del Bufalo, Canon of the Basilica of St. Mark's, Rome, and Founder of the Missionaries of the Precious Blood. (Heroism of his virtues decreed.)

Ven. Giovanna de Lestounac, Foundress of the Daughters of the B. Virgin. (Heroism of Virtues decreed.) *Vid. Catholic Times*, March 20, 1891.

**CANONS.**—Canons enjoy all the capitular rights and privileges, and are to be really considered Canons, although without stipend or prebend. The Bishop (of Perpignan) is authorised to reduce their obligations within certain specified limits. (*S. C. C.*, March 29, 1890.) *Vid. Tablet*, Jan 24, 1891.

**COMMUNION, FREQUENCY OF.**—In religious communities members should communicate on the days fixed by their rule ; if Confessor recommends more frequent Communion, the penitent to notify same to Superior. If such frequency thought inadvisable, the reasons to be laid before the Confessor, and his decision to determine the case. (*S. Cong. Ep. et Reg.*, Dec. 17, 1890.) *Vid. Tablet*, March 14, 1891.

**COMMUNION, PERMISSION FOR.**—In religious communities permission for communion rests with the Confessor, either ordinary or extraordinary, except in certain cases of external sin, or where fear of scandal requires other treatment. (*S. Cong. Ep. et Reg.*, Dec. 17, 1890.) *Vid. Tablet*, March 14, 1891.

**CONFESSOR, EXTRAORDINARY.**—An extraordinary Confessor is to be allowed to any member of a religious community, the Superior to ask for no reason, and to show no signs of annoyance. (*S. Cong. Ep. et Reg.*, Dec. 19, 1890.) *Vid. Tablet*, March 14, 1891.

**CONSCIENCE, MANIFESTATION OF.**—The Holy Father nullifies, in the case of religious communities of any kind whatever, whether with simple or solemn vows, also in the case of communities of laymen, any section of their constitutions which requires or allows the manifestation of heart or conscience to their Superiors or others. Such sections are to be expunged from the Constitutions, even in spite of an immemorial custom. Superiors are strictly forbidden to encourage it; the subjects are to denounce any Superior attempting it.

This does not prevent subjects from freely and of their own accord opening their minds to superiors for the sake of advice. (*S. Cong. Ep. et Reg.*, Dec. 17, 1890.) *Vid. Tablet*, March 14, 1891.

**CONSECRATION OF ORATORY** invalid because no altar was consecrated, a portable altar-stone being used for Mass. (*S. R. C.*, June 28, 1890.) *Vid. Tablet*, Feb. 14, 1891.

**DUELLING.**—Duelling, as carried on in the German Universities, produces irregularity, which attaches both to the duellist and to his supporters, on the ground of loss of character (*ex infamia juris*). (*S. C. C.*, Aug. 9, 1890.) *Vid. Tablet*, Jan. 17, 1891.

**EXORCISM.**—A new formula of Exorcism drawn up by Pope Leo XIII. Indulged with a daily partial, and a monthly plenary indulgence granted to bishops and to priests authorised to exorcise. (*S. Cong. de Prop. Fide*, May 18, 1890.) *Vid. Tablet*, Jan. 31, 1891.

**HOLY FAMILY, THE.**—The devotion practised under the title of the Holy Family, approved and warmly encouraged by Leo XIII. in a letter to the Card. Archbishop of Florence. An act of consecration and a form of prayer to the Holy Family, drawn up and indulged by the Holy Father. Nov. 20, 1890. *Vid. Tablet*, Jan. 10, 1891.

**WILL CHANGED.**—Money left for the establishment of a benefice in honour of the Seven Dolours allowed to be devoted to an orphanage, the establishment of a benefice being inadvisable in Italy under the existing laws of confiscation. (*S. Cong. Conc.*, Sep. 9, 1890.) *Vid. Tablet*, Feb. 7, 1891.

Poor relations ask for, and receive, a share of money left by a certain Canon for members of his family entering religion, wishing to marry, remaining unmarried till completion of fortieth year. (*S. C. C.*, Sept. 9, 1890.) *Vid. Tablet*, Feb. 28, 1891.

# INDEX.

- AFRICA, British East, 173 ; German South-West, 427 ; South, Company, 429  
German Expedition, 433.  
Agostino da Montefeltro, Conferences of, *noticed*, 218.  
Allegre, G., Impedimentorum Matrimonii Synopsis, *noticed*, 201.  
Allies, Thomas W., The Throne of the Fisherman, 371 ; Peter's Rock in  
Mohammed's Flood, *noticed*, 458.  
Amazon, Regions of the Upper, 432.  
Amherst, W. J., S.J., Valentine Riant, *noticed*, 237.  
Anglican Claim, The, to Historical Christianity, 371 : to Episcopal Indepen-  
dence, 372.  
Anglicans and the Lincoln Judgment, 127.  
Antarctic Expedition, 172.  
Aristotle, " Constitution of the Athenians," attributed to, 351 ; Arguments  
against authorship of, 352 ; How authorship imputed to, 357.  
Arundell of Wardour, Lord, Two Englishmen who served with distinction  
abroad—Sir E. Wydvile and Sir T. Arundell, 1.  
—— Sir Thomas, 11.  
Athenians, Constitution of, 351 *seq.*  
Ausberger, L., Die Christliche Eschatologie, *noticed*, 207.  
Australian Girl, An, *noticed*, 180.  
BAGWELL, R., Ireland under the Tudors, *noticed*, 451.  
Baker, Ven. F. Augustin, Hail Jesus ! *noticed*, 237 ; Holy Wisdom, *noticed*,  
199.  
Bargilliat, M., Jus Canonicum, *noticed*, 479.  
Baunard, Mgr., Countess de Choiseul d'Aillecourt, *noticed*, 458.  
Bechuanaland, British, 427.  
Bellesheim, Canon A., notices by, 219, 232, 236, 478, 483.  
Benedictine, Anglo-, Congregation, 402, 446.  
Berlière, Dom U., Monasticon Belge, *noticed*, 219.  
Bernard, St., against Abelard, 257 ; and Scholasticism, 261.  
Bikelas, Demetrios, Christian Greece, *noticed*, 206.  
Black, William, Stand Fast Craig Royston ! *noticed*, 438.  
—— is White, or Continuity Continued, *noticed*, 476.  
Blackie, J. A., Love's Victory, *noticed*, 486.  
Bliard, P., Saint Simon et le Père Le Tellier, *noticed*, 474.  
Bond, W., The Immortals, *noticed*, 485.  
Bougaud, Mgr., Revelations of the Sacred Heart, *noticed*, 238.  
Breviarium Romanum, *noticed*, 216.  
Bridgett, T. E., Life of B. John Fisher, *noticed*, 210 ; Life of Sir Thomas  
More, *noticed*, 447.  
Bright, W., Three Great Fathers, *noticed*, 472.  
Brownlow, W. R., Memoir of Sir James Marshall, *noticed*, 193.  
Buckley, Arabella B., Through Magic Glasses, *noticed*, 224.

- CANTU's Universal History, 442.  
 Casarelli, Dr. L. C., Notes on Commercial Geography, 35.  
 Catechismus ad Parochos, *noticed*, 201.  
 Catholic Directory, Annual, and Almanac, *noticed*, 216.  
 ——— Truth Society's Publications, *noticed*, 481.  
 Cavanagh, F. Pius, Maxims of St. Thomas Aquinas, *noticed*, 237.  
 Century Dictionary, The, *noticed*, 468.  
 Chile, Character of the Colonisation of, 309; Climate of, 310; Resources of, 311; Agricultural development of, 315; Labour system in, 317; Insurrection in, 325.  
 China, Wanderings in Western, 169; Trade between Russia and, 171.  
 Church, Anglican and Catholic Views of, 374 *seq.*  
 Clair, Charles, S.J., Vie de St. Ignace, *noticed*, 198.  
 Clement, St., and Papal Authority, 375.  
 Clerke, Miss E. M., The Teaching of Economic Geography, 35; The Insurrection in Chile, 308.  
 Commerce, Effect of climate on, 36; Effect of geological structure on, 40; Systems of communication: water transit, 41; Cosmopolitan character of modern, 45; Fashions and caprices of "demand," 47; Growth of British, 425.  
 Compton, Herbert, The Dead Man's Gift, *noticed*, 182.  
 Concilii Vaticani Acta et Decreta, *noticed*, 232.  
 Congo, Free State, 431; Exploration of affluents of, *ibid.*  
 "Constitution of the Athenians" attributed to Aristotle, 351; Historical value of, 358; Criticism of style of, 368.  
 "Continuity" recognised in Lincoln Judgment, 130.  
 Conway, Rev. J., Rights of Our Little Ones, *noticed*, 229.  
 Corinth in St. Paul's Day, 327; Church of and St. Clement, 374.  
 Corinthians, St. Paul's First Epistle to, Commentary on, 329 *seq.*  
 Cornely, R., S.J., Commentarius in Corinthios, *noticed*, 218; On 1 Cor. xv. 28, 329.  
 Coupe, Charles, The Homage of Christ the King, 327.  
 Crawford, F. M., A Cigarette Maker's Romance, *noticed*, 179.  
 Crown of Thorns, The, *noticed*, 237.
- DANCES, Indian Ghost, 175.  
 Daughter of King Solomon, *noticed*, 183.  
 Deland, Margaret, Sidney, *noticed*, 178.  
 Delitzsch, F., Commentary on Isaiah, *noticed*, 483.  
 Devas, C. S., English Catholics and the Social Question, 110.  
 Didon, P., Jésus-Christ, *noticed*, 211.  
 Doreau, Dom V., Henry VIII. et les Martyrs, *noticed*, 470.  
 Douls, M. Camille, 429.  
 Dreves, G. M., S.J., Hymnological Works, *noticed*, 478.  
 Driver, S. D., Notes on Hebrew Text of Samuel, *noticed*, 226.  
 Dymock, J., The Great Sacrifice of the New Law, *noticed*, 200.
- ECONOMY, Political, and Catholic Teaching, 111.  
 Egger, Bishop, Catholic Young Man, *noticed*, 231.  
 Electric Railway, The South London, 162.  
 Electricity, Magneto-Optical Generation of, 164.  
 English Catholics and the Social Question, 110.  
 Examinations, Physical Tests in, 165.
- FALCONER, L., Mademoiselle Ixe, *noticed*, 433.  
 Filion, L. Cl., Atlas de la Bible, *noticed*, 217.



- Forgotten Heroines, *noticed*, 229.  
 Fouard, C., The Christ the Son of God, *noticed*, 456.  
 Ford, Isabella O., Miss Blake of Monkshalton, *noticed*, 179.  
 Francis, St., and Feudalism, 192.  
 French Revolution, and Ireland, 96; French Clergy before the, 190.  
 Frost, The Recent Great, Dry Period, 413.  
 Fyfe, James, The Hereafter, *noticed*, 234.
- GASQUET, Dr. J. R., Hypnotism, 241.  
 Gems, Little, from Thomas à Kempis, &c., *noticed*, 238.  
 Geography, The Teaching of Economic, 35.  
 Gietmann, G., S.J., Commentarius in Ecclesiasten et Canticum Canticorum, *noticed*, 227.  
 Gilli, Don Gaspar, Month of Mary, *noticed*, 238.  
 Gilmartin, T., Manual of Church History, *noticed*, 459.  
 Goldie, J., S.J., St. Vincent de Paul, *noticed*, 481.  
 Gonzales, Cardinal, Histoire de la Philosophie, *noticed*, 479.  
 "Granville Library," Tales, *noticed*, 488.  
 Grattan, 98.  
 Gregory the Great, Pontificate of, 443.
- HALE, Susan, Mexico, *noticed*, 222.  
 Harte, Bret, A Waif of the Plains, *noticed*, 182.  
 Hayman, Henry, D.D., "The Constitution of the Athenians" attributed to Aristotle, 351.  
 Hefele's Conciliengeschichte, Hergenröther's Edition of, *noticed*, 236.  
 Herbert, Lady, The, Ven. Curé of Ars, *noticed*, 481.  
 Hesel, G., S.J., Monotesseron Evangelicum, *noticed*, 201.  
 Heywood, J. C., Lady Merton, *noticed*, 434.  
 History of England, Catholic Child's, *noticed*, 488.  
 Hogarth, D. G., Devia Cypria, *noticed*, 477.  
 Homage, The, of Christ the King, 327.  
 Hornung, Ernest G., A Bride from the Bush, *noticed*, 181.  
 Houghton, Lord, 22.  
 Howatt, Rev. J. R., Agnostic Fallacies, *noticed*, 230.  
 Hugh, St., of Lincoln, *noticed*, 208.  
 Hughes, Rev. J., Principles of Anthropology and Biology, *noticed*, 235.  
 Hungerford, Mrs., A Born Coquette, *noticed*, 435.  
 Hypnotism, 241; Two schools of, 242; Susceptibility to, 243; Theory of, 247; Limits to, 250; Dangers of, 251.
- IBSEN, H., Hedda Gabler, *noticed*, 485.  
 Influenza, The Meteorology of, 167.  
 Insurrection in Chile, 308.  
 "Irishmen, United," Object of, 97, 102.  
 Italy, American opinion on, 444.
- JACOBIN Movement, The, in Ireland, 95.  
 Jeanne d'Arc, New literature on, 54; "Mission" of, 56; The coronation at Reims not the end of her mission, 58; Taken prisoner, 60; The trial according to original documents, 61 *seq.*  
 Jenkins, Rev. T. J., Christian Schools, *noticed*, 229.
- KASHMIR, Progress of, 174.  
 Keary, C. F., The Vikings of Western Christendom, *noticed*, 469.  
 Kennedy, J. H., Natural Theology and Modern Thought, *noticed*, 474.

Kleutgen, Father, 265.

Koch, Dr., Remedy for Tubercular Disease, 161.

LABOUR Question, 112 *seq.*; and Congress of Liège, 117.

Lasausse, Abbé, A Happy Year, *noticed*, 487.

Lecky, Mr., on Irish Affairs since 1793, 96.

Leech, H. B., Registration of Title *v.* Registration on Assurances, *noticed*, 476.

Leo XIII., Letter of, to People of Italy, 147; Letter of, on Anglo-Benedictine Congregation, 402; Letter of, on slavery, 410.

Leyton, F., The Shadows of the Lake, *noticed*, 487.

Lifeboats, Steam, 414.

Lilly, W. S., The Jacobin Movement in Ireland, 95.

Lincoln Judgment, The, 121; Singular reception of, 122; Unhistorical character of, 124; Not thought compromising by Anglicans, 127; Protestantism of, 137.

Literature, Dangers of Modern, 276.

Lynch, Hannah, The Prince of the Glades, *noticed*, 436.

MACKONOSHIE, A. H., *noticed*, 475.

Maher, M., S.J., on Psychology, 266.

Maid of Orleans, The, by the light of original documents, 54.

Malet, Lucas, The Wages of Sin, *noticed*, 437.

Manica, 427.

Manna, A Fall of, 445.

Manning, Cardinal, Reprints of Writings of, *noticed*, 237; Our National Vice, *noticed*, 481.

Manual, Little, of Third O.S.F., *noticed*, 238.

Margaret Mary, Blessed, One and Thirty Days with, *noticed*, 238.

Martin, Mrs. Charles, Life of St. Justin, *noticed*, 237.

Maumus, E. V., St. Thomas et la Philosophie Cartésienne, *noticed*, 473.

Mazzolini, S., Evangelium Sec. Lucam in Carmina Versum, *noticed*, 230.

Médaille, P., Meditations on the Gospels, *noticed*, 480.

Milky Way, The, 422.

Milnes, R. Monckton, Lord Houghton, 22; As a politician, 23; Ancestry of, 25; Love of Italy, 28; Sympathy with Catholicism, 29; Lines on Rome, 30; As a conversationalist, 31; *Bons mots* of, 32.

Monsabré, Père, Marriage, *noticed*, 487.

Moran, Archbishop, Occasional Papers, *noticed*, 203.

Morris, J., S.J., Blessed Juvenal Ancina, *noticed*, 481.

Motais, A., Origine du Monde, *noticed*, 215.

Mount Blanc, Scientific Ascent of, 158.

Murphy, T., The Life of Our Lord, *noticed*, 230.

NATIONAL Churches, Independence of, 371.

Nebulae, Motion of the, 157; Ring, in Lyra, 424.

Newman, J. H., Letters and Correspondence of, *noticed*, 460; Lectures, *noticed*, 481.

Nice, Council of, and Papal Authority, 392.

Nisard, Th., L'Archéologie Musicale, *noticed*, 220.

Northcote, V. Rev. J. Spencer, Fourfold Difficulty of Anglicanism, *noticed*, 481.

Notes on Novels, 178, 433.

— of Travel and Exploration, 169, 425.

Notices, Science, 157, 413.

— of Catholic Continental Periodicals: French, 190; German, 184, 439; Italian, 186, 442.

OLIPHANT, Mrs., Kirsteen, *noticed*, 434.

O'Reilly, P. J., Ober-Ammergau in 1890, *noticed*; 488.

Orelli, C. von, Prophecies of Isaiah, *noticed*, 230.

PALLAIN, G., Talleyrand, 290.

Parsons, Mrs., Thomas Rileton, *noticed*, 231.

Peacock, Edward, Richard Monckton Milnes, Lord Houghton, 22.

Peard, Frances Mary, Mademoiselle, *noticed*, 178.

Péries, G., La Faculté de Droit à Paris, *noticed*, 464.

Philosophy, Modern Catholic, 255 *seq*; In England, The Pope and, 272; and English Social Dangers, 274 *seq*; Courses of, 285.

Photo-Electricity, Action of Light on Selenium, 418.

Pillett, A., Jus Canonium Generale, *noticed*, 201.

Plunket, Ven. Oliver, *noticed*, 481.

Pollen, J. H., S.J., Acts of English Martyrs, *noticed*, 449.

Pope, The, and Catholic Philosophy in England, 272.

Praxis, Synodalis, *noticed*, 201.

Prince, A., Of Joyous Gard, *noticed*, 435.

RAE, Rev. C. McDermott, The Kingdom of God, *noticed*, 233.

Railway, The Trans-Sahara, 173; Siberian, 428.

Ransome, Cyril, Elementary History of England, *noticed*, 488.

Reid, T. Wemyss, Life and Letters of R. Monckton Milnes, 22.

Review, The Popular, Dangers of, 276.

Rivington, Rev. Luke, The Lincoln Judgment; or Continuity, 121; The Anglican Claim to Historical Christianity, 371.

Rome, Origin of Authority of, 379, 384; Nature of Intervention of, 386; St. Irenæus on, 387; Reception of judgments from, 391; Council of Nice on, 392.

Rousset, C., L'Algérie, *noticed*, 225.

Russell, W. Clark, My Shipmate Louise, *noticed*, 180.

Russo, N., S.J., Philosophia Moralis, *noticed*, 205.

Ryan, Rev. E. J., The Secular Office, *noticed*, 237.

SAINTRAIN, Rev. H., The Sacred Heart in the Scriptures, *noticed*, 238.

Salvatore, P. de Philippis, Vade Mecum Confessoriorum, *noticed*, 201.

Sargeant, Adeline, A Life Sentence, *noticed*, 437.

Scannell, Rev. T. B., Talleyrand's Diplomatic Letters, 290.

Schneid, M., Naturphilosophie, *noticed*, 483.

Scholastic Movement, The, and Catholic Philosophy, 255; Notes of, 256; and Catholic theology, 262; and modern needs, 265.

Scott's Journal, 72; Period of Sir Walter's life contained in, 74; Entries as to pecuniary difficulties, 76, 90; Sketch of daily life, 79; Literary success and doubts as to excellence of work, 81; Loss of wife, 82; Illness and travels for health, 83; Winters abroad, 91; Debt of gratitude due to Scott from Catholics, 94.

Schürer, E., Jewish People in Time of Jesus Christ, *noticed*, 220; Index to, *noticed*, 482.

Sebastian, Father, C.P., Thesaurus Sacerdotum, *noticed*, 201.

Sire, Life of F. Charles, *noticed*, 238.

Smith, S. B., Compendium Juris Canonici, *noticed*, 201.

Social Congresses, Catholic, 111; Efforts open to Catholics, 113.

- Solar Disturbances, 420.  
 Stirling, J. H., Philosophy and Theology, *noticed*, 234.  
 Stolz, Rev. A., Mixed Marriage, *noticed*, 228.  
 Stonyhurst, The Pope and Catholic Philosophy at, 272.  
 Studia Biblica et Ecclesiastica, vol. ii., *noticed*, 233.  
 Switzerland: "Story of the Nations," *noticed*, 222.
- TALLEYRAND, Diplomatic Letters of, 290; Mission to London, 292; Return to Paris, 297; Apology for overthrow of monarchy, 298; Flies to America, 300; Return, 301.  
 Teaching, The, of Economic Geography, 35.  
 Theological Influence of the B. Virgin. The, *noticed*, 489.  
 Thomas Aquinas, St., and Catholic Philosophy, 258 *seq.*  
 Tickell, G., S.J., Life of B. Margaret Mary, *noticed*, 211.  
 Two Englishmen who served abroad with distinction, 1.
- UNION, The Legislative, with Ireland, 103.  
 Urban VI., The Election of, 191.  
 Ushaw College, The Pope and Philosophy at, 273.
- VATICANI, Acta et Decreta Concilii, *noticed*, 232.  
 Vaughan, Archbishop, Life of St. Thomas of Aquin, Dom Jerome Vaughan's Abridgment, *noticed*, 237.  
 Venus, Rotation of, 159.  
 Vigouroux, F., Le N. Testament et les Découvertes modernes, *noticed*, 213.  
 Virgin, The Christian, *noticed*, 237.
- WARD, Wilfrid, The Scholastic Movement and Catholic Philosophy, 255.  
 Water, Relation of Ground, to Disease, 416.  
 "Waverley," Acknowledgment of Authorship of, 88.  
 Wax Insect, The White, 170.  
 Way of the Cross, The Holy, *noticed*, 237.  
 Werner, O., Orbis Terrarum Catholicus, *noticed*, 229.  
 Wilson, J. Spottiswoode, Geological Mechanism, *noticed*, 235.  
 Wydville, Sir Edward, 1.  
 Wyndham, Rev. Francis M., The Maid of Orleans, by the Light of Original Documents, 54.
- YEATS, John, Manuals of Commerce, 35.  
 Yucatan, Commerce of, 53.
- ZAMBESI, First British War Ship in, 177.

END OF VOL. XXV.

